Office-Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
JAN 7 1963
JOHN F. DAVIS, CLERK

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1962

No. 726

ROBERT GUIPPONE,

Petitioner,

—against—

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondent.

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

THEODORE KRIEGER
11 Broadway
New York 4, N. Y.
Attorney for Petitioner

62 Cas Pasc Inc., 421 Hudson St., N.Y.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
PETITION	1
A. The Opinion Below	1
B. Jurisdiction	2
C. Questions Presented	2
D. The Statutes	2
E. Summary Statement of Matters Involved	3
F. Reasons for Granting the Writ:	
I. Neither a single continuing or one over-all conspiracy was established	3
II. Evidence obtained by wire tapping was admitted	5
III. The arguments presented in the petition for the granting of a writ of certiorari of the co-petitioner Charles Shiffman submitted herewith simultaneously and arising out of the same Judgment of the United States Court of Appeals (Second Circuit) entitled *United States of America* v. *Vito Agueci, et al.* decided November 8, 1962 are adopted on behalf of petitioner as though at length set forth	8
CONCLUSION	8
APPENDIX A	1a
APPENDIX B	53a

PAGE

Authorities Cited

Cases

Kotteakos v. United States, 328 U. S. 750 (1946) 5

Olmstead v. United States, 277 U. S. 438 (1928) 7

United States v. Falcone (2nd Cir., 1940), 109 F. 2nd 579 5

United States v. Russano (2nd Cir., 1958), 257 F. 2d 712 5

U. S. v. Siebricht (2nd Cir., 1932), 59 F. 2nd 976 5

Statutes

21 U.S.C. Secs. 173 and 174 .... 2, 3

28 U.S.C., Sec. 1254(1) 2

Rules of the Supreme Court

Rule 19 2

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1962

No.

ROBERT GUIPPONE,

Petitioner,

—against—

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondent.

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

To the Honorable, the Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States:

The petitioner, Robert Guippone, prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit entered against him in the above entitled case on November 8, 1962.

A. The Opinion Below

The opinion of the Court of Appeals in this case has not at yet been officially reported. It is set forth in Appendix A annexed to this petition.

B. Jurisdiction

The judgment of the Court of Appeals was entered on November 8, 1962. On December 7, 1962, Mr. Justice John M. Harlan granted an order extending the time of the petitioner to file his petition for a writ of certiorari to and including January 7, 1963. The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under Rule 19 of the Supreme Court Rules and Title 28, United States Code, Section 1254(1) on the ground that review by the Supreme Court by writ of certiorari is sought of a judgment of affirmance on appeal by the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

C. Questions Presented

The questions specifically raised by the petitioner, Robert Guippone, are:

1. Whether a single, continuing or one over-all conspiracy was involved, and if so, was the membership therein of the petitioner, Guippone, proven beyond a reasonable doubt?

2. Whether evidence obtained as a result of wire tapping was introduced at the trial?

D. The Statutes

The statutes involved are: United States Code, Title 21, Sections 173 and 174.

All of the foregoing are set forth in full in Appendix B annexed to this petition.

E. Summary Statement of Matters Involved

A 30 Count indictment was returned against the petitioner and 19 other defendants alleging the crime of conspiracy to violate Title 21, Sections 173-174 of the United States Code and separately charged various defendants with substantive violations.

The petitioner together with 10 co-defendents were tried and found guilty as charged after a two month trial and thereafter sentenced to imprisonment to twenty (20) years imprisonment, which he is now serving.

On appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, the conviction of the petitioner as well as all other defendants were affirmed. The trial of the case took two months and the typewritten transcript totalled more than 8000 pages.

F. Reasons for Granting the Writ

I

Neither a single continuing or one over-all conspiracy was established.

The role of Petitioner Guippone was initially that of an underling of the defendant Valachi. It is therefore laconically set forth that if the defendant Valachi is deemed not to have been a member of the conspiracy, it likewise follows that Petitioner Guippone would not be a member. His position depends upon Valachi's role, if any, in the conspiracy.

However, even if this Court were to determine that Valachi was a member of the conspiracy, the involvement

of Guippone was not established. His role was clearly shown to be that of a partner with Rinaldo and Porcelli in the sale of narcotics. Rinaldo, Guippone and Porcelli had established their own enterprise, their own business, separate and apart from that of the conspiracy which is the subject matter of the instant indictment. Their activities were of a regular pattern and separate and apart from the activities of the other conspirators.

It is clear that the inclusion of a separate illegal course of conduct constituting a conspiracy as between Rinaldo, Guippone and Porcelli resulted in the submission of evidence as to two conspiracies.

The opinion of the Court of Appeals indicates that what was determinative of Guippone's connection with the entire conspiracy, was that Valachi, whom there was some indication was the employer of Guippone, introduced the petitioner and Porcelli to government witness Rinaldo. However, the court apparently misapprehended that even if Valachi were a member of the overriding conspiracy, the petitioner's involvement was not established. Subsequent to this introduction to Rinaldo, the evidence patently indicates that Rinaldo, Porcelli and the petitioner entered into a private and independent partnership relationship.

Conspiracy is a crime of intent. For intent there must be knowledge. Knowledge, not necessarily of the full scope of the conspiracy, but certainly the framed general scope. In the case of the petitioner, this not proven by the evidence.

It is submitted that the prosecution has sought to achieve the alchemist's goal of creating something out of nothing.

The establishment of a single continuing, or one over-all conspiracy which was elusive in *Kotteakos* v. *United States*, 328 U. S. 750 (1946), and in *United States* v. *Russano* (2nd Cir. 1958), 257 F. 2d 712, is elusive here. Whether it was occasioned, as is herein contended, by the joinder of disconnected conspiracies, resulting in the fatal variance found in *U. S.* v. *Siebricht* (2nd Cir., 1932), 59 F. 2nd 976, or by the disregard of the admonition of this court contained in *United States* v. *Falcone* (2nd Cir., 1940), 109 F. 2nd 579 at page 581:

> ". . . so many prosecutors seek to sweep within the dragnet of conspiracy all those who have been associated in any degree whatever with the main offenders. That there are opportunities of great oppression in such a doctrine is very plain, and it is only by circumscribing the scope of such all comprehensive indictments that they can be avoided."

is immaterial. Whatever the cause, the result is clear that the prosecution has not proven beyond a reasonable doubt the membership of Petitioner Guippone in, or the existence with clarion precision of a single continuing or one over-all conspiracy.

II

Evidence obtained by wire tapping was admitted.

During the course of the trial, evidence was introduced that the Westchester County Sheriff's office had engaged in wire tapping. Objection was timely made as to the admission of any evidence obtained through the wire tap or flowing therefrom and the Court ordered a hearing to be held thereon. This hearing clearly and manifestly showed that

the arrest and detention of co-conspirators Rinaldo and Palmieri was the result of the joint efforts of the State and Federal Law Enforcement authorities. The Government's position was that neither wire tap evidence nor the proof thereof were introduced at the trial, and that the State law enforcement activities and the efforts of the Bureau of Narcotics were completely divorced.

To say that the record supports and sustains the prosecution's contention or that the " . . . state officers sedulously avoided communicating wiretap information to the federal narcotics agents because of a consciousness that such evidence would pollute a federal prosecution . . . " (appendix page 36a), is to imitate the antics of an ostrich. Where two law enforcement agencies are working toward a similar goal and one agency allegedly withholds important information merely because it comes from a tainted source is to ignore the facts of everyday life. This is incredulous, strains one's imagination and indicates a complete lack of appreciation of the behavior of law enforcement officers engaged in a joint venture.

The issues as to the facts adduced at the hearing have been amply set forth in the petition of a co-petitioner Schiffman, and no purpose could possibly be served by repeating the substance contained therein.* Suffice to say, that petitioner contends as he contended at the trial that the testimony of Sheriff Thela as to the overheard conversation in front of the Gallery Dominick came about as a result of an intercepted telephonic communication. The testimony at

* Submitted herewith simultaneously and arising out of the same judgment of the United States Court of Appeals (Second Circuit) entitled *United States of America v. Vito Aquci et al.*, decided November 8, 1962.

the finding to the effect that Sheriff Thela just inadvertently happened to meet two Federal Narcotics Agents in the vicinity of the Gallery Dominick and that they suggested he attempt to overhear the conversation between Porcelli and Rinaldo, is unbelievable. There was no question that the telephone of Rinaldo and the Gallery Dominick were tapped, and that Porcelli had called the Gallery Dominick on October 17th and said that he would see Rinaldo on the following day.

"It should be realized that the "dirty business" which Justice Brandeis so vehemently castigated in *Olmstead v. United States*, 277 U. S. 438 (1928) has neither been cleansed through the passage of time nor honored by the frequency of its use.

"Wire tapping is a lawless method of law enforcement, and its use for any purpose is contrary to the basic precepts of the enlightened administration of criminal justice. In deference to recent decisions in the United States Court of Appeals and of this Court, it no longer is utilized by many District Attorneys of the State of New York, although its use is permitted under the constitution and statutes of the State of New York. Our society in contrast to those of other lands is founded upon the precept that the end is not justified by the means. To the contrary, the means used to obtain a lawful end must be lawful, and such was not the case here.

III

The arguments presented in the petition for the granting of a writ of certiorari of the co-petitioner Charles Shiffman submitted herewith simultaneously and arising out of the same Judgment of the United States Court of Appeals (Second Circuit) entitled *United States of America v. Vito Agueci, et al.* decided November 8, 1962 are adopted on behalf of petitioner as though at length set forth.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons hereinabove set forth this petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

THEODORE KRIEGER
Attorney for Petitioner

APPENDIX A

Opinion of the United States Court of Appeals

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

No. 99—October Term, 1962

(Argued October 4, 1962 Decided November 8, 1962)

Docket No. 27466

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Appellee,

v.

VITO AGUECI, FILIPPO COTTONE, ROBERT GUIPPONE, LUIGI LO BUE, MATTHEW PALMIERI, ANTHONY PORCELLI, CHARLES SHIFFMAN, ROCCO SCOPELLITTI, CHARLES TANDLER and JOSEPH VALACHI,

Defendants-Appellants.

Before:

LUMBARD, *Chief Judge,*
FRIENDLY and KAUFMAN, *Circuit Judges.*

Appeals from judgments of conviction for violation of, and conspiracy to violate, the federal narcotics laws, 21 U. S. C. §§ 173, 174, after a trial by jury before Herlands, J.

Appendix A

in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York.

Affirmed.

JULIAN C. TEPPER, New York, N. Y. *for Vito Agueci, appellant.*

JEROME LEWIS, New York, N .Y. (Theodore Krieger, New York, N. Y., on the brief), for *Filippo Cottone, appellant.*

LAWRENCE A. KOBRIN, New York, N. Y., *for Rocco Scopellitti, appellant.*

MENAHEM STIM, New York, N. Y., *for Joseph Valachi, appellant.*

FRANCES KAHN, New York, N. Y., for *Luigi Lo Bue, appellant.*

ALBERT J. KRIEGER, New York, N. Y., *for Charles Shiffman and Charles Tandler, appellants.*

THEODORE KRIEGER, JR., New York, N. Y., *for Robert Guippone, Anthony Porcelli and Matthew Palmieri, appellants.*

T. F. GILROY DALY, Assistant United States Attorney, Southern District of New York, New York, N. Y. (Vincent L. Broderick, United States Attorney, Sheldon H. Elsen, Arnold N. Enker, Michael F. Armstrong, Peter K. Leisure, Assistant United States Attorneys, on the brief), *for appellee.*

Appendix A

KAUFMAN, *Circuit Judge*:

The ten defendants before us appeal their convictions for violation of the federal narcotics laws, 21 U. S. C. §§ 173, 174. The defendants were sentenced to imprisonment for periods ranging from five years to twenty-five years,[1] after a two-month trial before a jury in the Southern District of New York. The indictment, filed on May 22, 1961, contained thirty counts. The first count charged all of the appellants and several others with conspiracy to violate the narcotics laws, commencing in September 1958 and continuing until May 1961; counts two through thirty separately charged various defendants with substantive violations. Several individuals were named in the indictment as coconspirators but not as defendants[2] and other coconspirators named as defendants were not tried below for various reasons.[3] Michael Maiello was also convicted but died while his appeal was pending.

At the trial, the Government's case depended principally upon the testimony of two witnesses, Salvatore Rinaldo and Matteo Palmeri, who had not been named as defend-

---

[1] Filippo Cottone received a five-year sentence; Rocco Scopellitti, ten years; Vito Agueci, Luigi Lo Bue, Anthony Porcelli, and Charles Tandler, fifteen years; Roberto Guippone, Matthew Palmieri, and Joseph Valachi, twenty years; Charles Shiffman, sentenced as a multiple narcotic offender, received a twenty-five year sentence.

[2] Charles Di Palermo, George Guido, Mario Mazzaro, Vito Mazzaro, Joseph Ragone, Rocco Sancinella, Salvatore Valente, and Ralph Wagner.

[3] William Holmes died before the trial and Albert Agueci, who was a fugitive, died during the trial. Vincent Mauro, Frank Caruso, Salvatore Maneri and Morris Taubman fled the jurisdiction. John Papalia had not, at the time of trial, been extradited from Canada. Arnold Barbeto was found incompetent to stand trial.

ants in the indictment but had been charged with participation in the conspiracy. Their testimony was offered to establish that the appellants and numerous other persons had engaged in a single conspiracy to import from Italy large quantities of heroin, which they adulterated, packaged, distributed, and sold in the United States. The conspiracy, defined generally involved the importation of narcotics into this country by concealed packages hidden in valises or false-bottom trunks, most of which were unwittingly brought to New York piers by Italian immigrants. These immigrants were requested to bring the trunks and valises to this country by a travel agent in Italy, purportedly as a favor to some friends here. Whenever this method proved for some reason unsatisfactory, one of the appellants would travel abroad in order personally to assure the success of the venture. For convenience, we may refer to the small body of conspirators who initiated the various importations and the subsequent distributions and sales of the narcotics as the "executive group." The Government's witnesses established that the members of this group were Albert Agueci,[4] Frank Caruso, Vincent Mauro, and John Papalia, none of whom are appellants, and Vito Agueci, Luigi LoBue, and Joseph Valachi, appellants here. In addition to these men, appellant Rocco Scopellitti was also implicated in the importation scheme, for he was alleged to have personally imported heroin into this country in August 1960.

Upon ascertaining the precise dates of the arrival in New York of the narcotics being imported, one of the members of the executive group would contact Matteo Palmeri,

[4] Albert Agueci, a fugitive at the time of trial, was killed during the course of the trial. His brother Vito is one of the appellants before us.

the Government witness, who ran a bakery in Brooklyn.[5] Palmeri, using his bakery truck, would drive to Pier 84 in Manhattan, seek out the immigrant who was bringing the trunk or valise containing the narcotics and identify himself as a friend of the Italian travel agent, and return with the trunk or valise to his bakery. On one occasion, when Palmeri's truck was out of order, he enlisted the aid of appellant Filippo Cottone. Palmeri was often assisted by Salvatore Rinaldo, the other chief witness for the Government. Rinaldo would perform a test on the white powder contained in the hidden packages to assure that it was heroin. The packages of narcotics were at first hidden in Palmeri's bakery, and later in Rinaldo's home in Mount Vernon.

Until October 21, 1960, when they were arrested, Palmeri and Rinaldo were the primary distributing agents for the conspiracy. They would be contacted by one of the members of the executive group and instructed to deliver a specified quantity of narcotics to a specified individual at a specified time. Thus, in the month of July 1959, Caruso told Rinaldo to meet with appellant Matthew Palmieri in order to consummate a sale. In December 1959, Valachi introduced appellant Anthony Porcelli to Rinaldo for a like purpose, and in April 1960, Porcelli introduced Rinaldo to another appellant, Ralph Guippone. The three coconspirators—Rinaldo, Porcelli and Guippone—would adulterate the heroin in Rinaldo's home, sell the product to other individuals named in the indictment but not here on appeal, and share in the proceeds of the sale. In May of

[5] Matteo Palmeri is not to be confused with Matthew Palmieri, one of the appellants.

Appendix A

1960, at a racetrack rendezvous, and at the instructions of Caruso, Rinaldo met with appellant Charles Shiffman who was later instrumental in arranging sales of narcotics from Rinaldo to appellant Charles Tandler.

This, in skeleton outline, is the manner in which the alleged conspiracy operated and the manner in which each of the appellants was implicated. This information will be helpful in giving form to the narrative of specific events, which follows.

The indictment charges a continuing conspiracy from September 1958 until the date of its filing, May 22, 1961. The testimony of Government witnesses Palmeri and Rinaldo establishes the sequence of events through October 21, 1960, when both were arrested. In October of 1958, Matteo Palmeri met Albert Agueci, one of the members of the executive group, in Brooklyn; in response to questioning, Palmeri indicated that he would be interested in participating in a plan to smuggle diamonds. The following month, appellant Luigi Lo Bue appeared at Palmeri's bakery in Brooklyn, and he informed Palmeri that he was aware of his interest in diamond smuggling, which information had been conveyed by Albert Agueci. In May of 1959, LoBue again contacted Palmeri, telling him to go to Pier 84 in order to pick up a valise from a named passenger and to identify himself (Palmeri) as a friend of Salvator Valenti, the Italian travel agent who was allegedly responsible for "planting" the valises with Italian immigrants. Palmeri did so and delivered the valise into LoBue's hands at the bakery. Some days later, LoBue returned to the bakery with five packages which he gave to Palmeri to be hidden. Soon after, Palmeri brought those

packages, on LoBue's instructions, to Vincent Mauro, who, along with LoBue, is alleged to have been a member of the executive group. Mauro, over the course of a few days, paid $15,000. to Palmeri, who in turn passed the money on to LoBue; Palmeri was rewarded for his efforts with $300.

In July 1959, LoBue told Palmeri that he had received a letter from Italy and that Palmeri should report to the pier and meet the passenger named in the letter, procure the valise, and return to the bakery. Palmeri did so, and upon observing LoBue remove a blanket from the valise, cut it open and withdraw packages of white powder, Palmeri was told by LoBue that they were dealing not in diamonds but in narcotics. Again, Palmeri was requested to hide the packages, and he again made another sale at Mauro's direction, receiving $15,000. That month, Palmeri was introduced to Salvatore Rinaldo, the other chief Government witness, and from that time Palmeri delivered heroin to Rinaldo, in order to facilitate the latter's sales. The first such sale was from Rinaldo to defendant Matthew Palmeri, in exchange for $8500., which money Rinaldo transmitted to Caruso. This incident occurred in July 1959. Another sale on precisely the same terms was carried out between Rinaldo and appellant Palmeri on March 21, 1960.

Rinaldo's position as central distributor became even more secure when, in December 1959, Mauro, of the executive group, told appellant Valachi, another member of that group, that narcotics were to be picked up from Rinaldo, Valachi met with Rinaldo that month, and introduced him to appellant Anthony Porcelli; Valachi said that Porcelli

was working for him and that it would be Porcelli who would pick up narcotics from Rinaldo in the future. The next morning, with Valachi standing nearby, Rinaldo delivered a package of heroin to Porcelli, which was paid for over the course of two or three weeks. Rinaldo turned over the proceeds of the sale to Caruso. In January of 1960, Rinaldo was introduced to two additional contacts[6] to whom further sales were made.

In late January, LoBue notified Palmieri, the baker, that a third shipment of narcotics was arriving in a valise carried by a named Italian immigrant on March 7, 1960. Palmeri performed his usual function, retrieved the valise with the hidden packages of narcotics, and passed these on to Rinaldo, who tested a sample of the substance from each of the packages. He found it to be heroin. Soon thereafter, on March 19, Rinaldo met with appellant Valachi, who informed him that "he was going away", and that in his absence, Rinaldo should deal with appellant Porcelli and with one Michael Maiello. Valachi said that although he was going away, Porcelli and Maiello would be taking care of him and sharing with him any profits these two would make on the sale of narcotics. It turned out that Valachi was indeed "going away" soon, for nine days later he surrendered to federal authorities on another charge and was incarcerated in prison.

Losing little time, Porcelli went to Rinaldo's home in Mount Vernon, in April 1960, and introduced appellant Robert Guippone; he said that Guippone was one of the men who was carrying on in Valachi's interest while Val-

[6] Ralph Wagner, named in the indictment but not a defendant below; and William Holmes, named as a co-defendant below who died before trial.

achi was imprisoned. Plans were made to dilute quantities of heroin with milk sugar, to sell them, and share the profits. The dilution and sales were made on several occasions in the months of May, June, August, and September 1960, and Rinaldo, Porcelli, and Guippone shared in the handsome profits, with some of the money going, on at least one occasion, to Caruso. These transactions represent the eleven substantive counts on which both Porcelli and Guippone were convicted.

At approximately the same time that Guippone and Porcelli first met with Rinaldo in April 1960, a meeting of several members of the executive group took place at a Manhattan restaurant. They there decided that future narcotic importations would be in trunks with false bottoms rather than in valises. That month, appellant Vito Agueci went to Italy, for what he claimed was a visit to his aged parents. The Government, of course, places a different interpretation on the facts and points out that this was not the only purpose to be reasonably inferred from this trip, for proof was introduced that in May of that year, Vito Agueci wrote a letter from Italy to Palmeri, telling him that a trunk and a valise would be brought into this country on June 2, 1960, and that Palmeri should be there to pick them up. Rinaldo accompanied Palmeri to the pier at that time; he later tested the packages secreted in the trunk and valise and found them to contain heroin, weighing fifteen kilograms.

Notification of the next shipment came quickly upon the heels of the June 2 importation. In July, Palmeri received a letter from Salvatore Valenti, the Italian "travel agent", informing him that appellant Rocco Scopellitti was to ar-

rive from Italy on August 10. On that morning, Palmeri was contacted by Albert Agueci, appellant's brother and member of the executive group, who told him that Scopellitti worked for him and was to be fully trusted.[6] At the pier, Scopellitti and Palmeri loaded the trunk into Palmeri's truck and drove back to the bakery. En route, Palmeri asked Scopellitti when he was returning to Italy and Scopellitti replied that he would go whenever Albert Agueci wanted him to pick up another trunk. When they reached the bakery, they were greeted by Rinaldo, who had earlier been instructed by two members of the executive group that he was no longer to accompany Palmeri to Pier 84 but was to wait for him at the bakery. Palmeri introduced Scopellitti, telling Rinaldo that Scopellitti was "all right", and that he had made the trip from Italy with the trunk; Scopellitti, to dispel any further doubt, said-"Don't worry. I know what it's all about." The three proceeded to rip open the false bottom of the trunk which revealed packages of heroin.[7] Rinaldo took the packages to his home; he tested them and found them to contain heroin.

While these two shipments of June and August 1960 were being planned and consummated, Rinaldo was making further sales at the behest of the executive group. In late May, Caruso told him to meet with appellant Charles Shiffman at the Roosevelt Raceway, which Rinaldo did. A night or two later, Rinaldo was introduced to appellant Charles Tandler. It was there agreed that Shiffman would

[7] Scopellitti contends, however, that the Government's proof indicates that he was requested to leave before the packages of narcotics were removed from the bottom of the trunk, and that there was thus no proof that he was aware of the substance allegedly smuggled into the country.

transmit certain code phone calls from Shiffman to Rinaldo, whereupon Rinaldo would meet with Tandler at an appointed rendezvous for the purpose of selling him narcotics. Pursuant to this plan, Rinaldo delivered three kilograms of heroin to Tandler shortly after this meeting at the race-track. Three kilograms were again delivered to Tandler on August 13 and four more in early October. On October 10, Shiffman and an associate paid Rinaldo $25,200 for the last sale to Tandler, and Rinaldo turned the money over to Caruso.

The fifth shipment of narcotics was again preceded by a letter from Italy, informing Palmeri that a trunk would arrive on September 2. Palmeri drove to Pier 84 but was unable to claim the trunk because he could not find the immigrant who had shepherded it from Italy. After some frantic phone calls and some impatient days of waiting, it was finally learned that the claim check and the keys to the trunk could be found at a given address in Garfield, New Jersey. Palmeri procured the check and the keys, and was prepared to set out for the pier when he found that his truck was not in working order. Albert Agueci previously had informed Palmeri that in case of such difficulties he should contact Filippo Cottone, one of the appellants. Palmeri did so and told Cottone that he needed his help to get down to the pier to pick up a trunk containing narcotics; he promised Cottone $300 for his services. En route from the pier back to the bakery, Cottone was critical of Palmeri and his associates for the mishandling of the pick-up of the trunk, "I can't understand * * * how you people do things, it is ridiculous"; he added that there had been

no trouble with the other shipments. At the bakery, where Rinaldo was again waiting, Cottone was introduced by Palmeri, who endorsed him as being "all right". The three ripped open the trunk's false bottom, which contained ten packages of heroin. Cottone took away one of the blankets in which three kilograms of heroin were concealed but which Palmeri had overlooked; these were soon retrieved by Palmeri. Rinaldo again tested samples and found heroin.

Vito Agueci, during the month of September 1960, took a second trip to Italy. From there, he notified Palmeri that another shipment was due October 21st, and Palmeri in turn notified Rinaldo. Rinaldo relayed the message to Porcelli in a conversation with him in Mount Vernon. Shortly before the narcotics were to arrive, Caruso of the executive group informed Rinaldo that the woman who ran Palmeri's bakery was growing suspicious; all future imported trunks were therefore to be taken directly from the pier to Rinaldo's house. Palmeri was informed of the new routine, and on October 21 both he and Rinaldo went to Pier 84 and picked up what was to be the last shipment of narcotics. It was en route to Rinaldo's home in Mount Vernon that both men were arrested by Westchester County police and federal narcotics agents. The trunk they were transporting was found to contain ten kilograms of what was determined by United States Government chemists to be heroin.

Appendix A

I.

We shall first consider those contentions raised by the appellants which affect all or several of them; we shall then proceed to discuss those contentions specifically raised on behalf of particular defendants.

The Conspiracy Instruction

The appellants challenge the propriety of the trial court's instructions regarding the scienter necessary to a finding of conspiracy to violate the federal narcotics law, specifically, 21 U. S. C. § 174. Even assuming that defendants may be heard to complain despite their failure to call the alleged error to the judge's attention, see *Screws* v. *United States*, 325 U. S. 91, 107 (1945); *United States* v. *Atkinson*, 297 U. S. 157, 160 (1936); *United States* v. *Massiah*, 307 F. 2d 62 (2d Cir. 1962), we hold that Judge Herlands adequately covered in his charge all the elements necessary to warrant a finding of guilt for participation in a narcotics conspiracy. He charged as follows:

> "Count 1 of the indictment charges that each of the defendants on trial conspired to violate the Federal Narcotic Laws. In order to convict under the first count of the indictment, you would have to find:
>
> First: that sometime between September 1, 1958 and May 22, 1961, in the Southern District of New York, a conspiracy to violate the narcotic laws existed between any one of the defendants on trial and any other defendant, either on trial or not on trial, or any co-conspirator named in the indictment.

Second: you would have to find that it was part of this conspiracy to do any one of the following:

a. Unlawfully import and bring large amounts of narcotic drugs into the United States from Italy; or

b. To receive, conceal, buy, sell and facilitate the transportation, concealment and sale of large amounts of narcotic drugs after they had been imported and brought into the United States, knowing that the said narcotic drugs had been brought into the United States illegally; or

c. To dilute, mix and adulterate large quantities of the *said* narcotic drugs prior to distribution.

Third: In addition to your finding that there was a conspiracy, and that it was part of the conspiracy to do one of these three things just enumerated, you would have to find that at least one of the 14 overt acts charged in the indictment was actually committed * * *.

The fourth and final element you would have to find as to each of the defendants is that he knowingly became a member of the conspiracy." (Emphasis added.)

This instruction made it plain beyond challenge that the crime charged was a conspiracy to violate the narcotics law and that requisite to a finding of such violation is knowing participation in a scheme having as an objective the importation of narcotics contrary to law, or the knowing transportation or facilitation of sales of narcotics after they have been knowingly brought into the country illegally, or the knowing adulteration of those very narcotics. It is thus clear that *United States* v. *Massiah*, 307 F. 2d 62

(1962), recently decided by this Court (Chief Judge Lumbard dissenting)—even assuming its correctness—is not in point. The fatal error in the judge's instruction in *Massiah* was his failure "*at any point* in his charge on the conspiracy count to instruct the jury that knowledge of illegal importation was a necessary element of the conspiracy" to violate the narcotic laws, 307 F. 2d 70. (Italics in the original). There the trial judge devoted his instructions to those elements common to all criminal conspiracies rather than focussing on the narcotics aspect of the conspiracy; the latter would have required that the jury find the defendants to have had knowledge that the narcotics had been or were to be unlawfully imported.

Not only did the trial judge in *Massiah* fail affirmatively to instruct the jury on the element of knowledge, but it was determined on appeal that certain passages in the court's discussion of the general law of conspiracy actually "suggested to the jury that knowledge of importation was not necessary * * *" (307 F. 2d at 70). The majority of the Court cited this passage from the charge: "One may become a member of a conspiracy without full knowledge of all the details of the conspiracy or of all the conspirators." Appellants point to a similar passage in Judge Herlands' charge, but even in that passage, there is an important difference in emphasis. He stated: "It is not necessary that one be fully informed as to the details of the scope of the conspiracy *in order to justify an inference of knowledge on his part.*" (Emphasis added.) This instruction pointedly emphasized the need to find that the defendants charged with conspiracy had *knowledge* of the general illicit purposes of importation, transportation, or

adulteration; it cautioned the jury that omniscience regarding every aspect of the conspiracy was not indispensable to a finding of such knowledge but that legitimate and reasonable inferences of such knowledge could be drawn. This is an unchallenged maxim of criminal law. We recently held in *United States* v. *Aviles*, 274 F. 2d 179, 188 (2d Cir.), cert. denied, 362 U. S. 974 (1960), that individuals who purchased narcotics from one of the conspirators were themselves participants in the conspiracy if "it is clear that they knew the nature of the operation. Whether they knew its full extent and all of its activities and actors is immaterial." See *United States* v. *Rich*, 262 F. 2d 415, 418 (2d Cir. 1959).

Upon a reading of the whole charge, see *Carey* v. *United States*, 296 F. 2d 422, 426 (D. C. Cir. 1961), *Gilmore* v. *United States*, 256 F. 2d 565 (5th Cir. 1958), we are convinced that the jury had constantly before it the judge's admonition that the elements set down in 21 U. S. C. § 174, among them knowledge of the illegal importation, were indispensable to a finding of guilt on the conspiracy count.

EVIDENCE OF A SINGLE OVERALL CONSPIRACY

Several appellants contend that, although the indictment charged a single continuing conspiracy from late in 1958 until the time of the filing of the indictment, there was proof of several separate and independent conspiracies. The variance in proof is deemed by these appellants to be of such a serious and prejudicial nature that reversal is required. See *Kotteakos* v. *United States*, 328 U. S. 750 (1946); *United States* v. *Russano*, 257 F. 2d 172 (2d Cir.

1958). We find that there was ample proof to warrant the finding of a single continuing conspiracy.

The Government's evidence successfully assimilates the conspiracy before us to the model of the so-called "chain" conspiracy, so familiar in other narcotic cases. See *Blumenthal* v. *United States*, 332 U. S. 539 (1947); *United States* v. *Aviles*, 274 F. 2d 179 (2d Cir.), cert. denied, 362 U. S. 974 (1960); *United States* v. *Stromberg*, 268 F. 2d 256 (2d Cir.), cert. denied, 361 U. S. 863 (1959); *United States* v. *Rich*, 262 F. 2d 415 (2d Cir. 1959). The "chain" conspiracy has as its ultimate purpose the placing of the forbidden commodity into the hands of the ultimate purchaser. See Note, "Federal Treatment of Multiple Conspiracies," 57 Colum. L. Rev. 387, 390 (1957). That form of conspiracy is dictated by a division of labor at the various functional levels—exportation of the drug from Europe and importation into the United States, adulteration and packaging, distribution to reliable sellers, and ultimately the sale to the narcotics user. Here, the members of the executive group—among them, appellants Vito Agueci, Luigi LoBue, and Joseph Valachi—formed the core of conspirators. They arranged for the exportation of large quantities of narcotics from Italy, for their importation into this country, and for their safe delivery from the New York piers for ultimate distribution by Palmeri into the hands of Rinaldo who would arrange for sales in successive transactions. Scopellitti and Cottone were participants, each on one occasion, in this process. Rinaldo was shown to be the central distributor, the key "link" in the "chain", and from him the distribution and sale links—composed of Porcelli, Guippone, Palmieri,

Shiffman, and Tandler—carried the narcotics to the ultimate purchaser.

Guippone and Porcelli contend that the evidence against them reveals, at best, a separate enterprise between them and Rinaldo, devoted to the adulteration and sale of narcotics quite independent of the conduct of the other members of the conspiracy. The answer to this is that the mere fact that certain members of the conspiracy deal recurrently with only one or two others does not exclude a finding that they were bound together in one conspiracy. Here, there was ample proof that both Porcelli and Guippone were left to carry on the interests of appellant Valachi while the latter was in prison. Valachi had indeed introduced appellant Porcelli to Rinaldo and stood nearby when a sale was consummated between the two. Both Porcelli and Guippone had to be aware, by the nature of the enterprise, that Rinaldo was constantly being supplied with new quantities of narcotics; their repeated adulterations of the narcotics over a period of several months, their expressed intention to carry on the interests of Valachi, one of the members of the executive group, their splitting of the profits of their sales on at least one occasion with Caruso, another member of the executive group, readily support that conclusion. Knowing of these outside sources, it was enough to make Porcelli and Guippone members of the overall conspiracy that the success of their "independent" venture was wholly dependent upon the success of the entire "chain". *United States* v. *Bruno*, 105 F. 2d 921 (2d Cir.), rev'd on other grounds, 308 U. S. 287 (1939); see *United States* v. *Aviles*, 274 F. 2d at 188. An individual associating himself with a "chain" conspiracy knows that it has a "scope" and that

for its success it requires an organization wider than may be disclosed by his personal participation. Merely because the Government in this case did not show that each defendant knew each and every conspirator and every step taken by them did not place the complaining appellants outside the scope of the single conspiracy. Each defendant might be found to have contributed to the success of the overall conspiracy, notwithstanding that he operated on only one level. See *United States* v. *Stromberg*, *supra*.

The nature of the enterprise determines whether the inference of knowledge of the existence of others in one overall conspiracy is justified. It is clear that in a narcotic conspiracy case of this nature no one member of the group can by himself insure the success of the venture; he must know that combined efforts are required. See *United States* v. *Bruno*, *supra*, at 922. "[T]he conspirators at one end of the chain knew that the unlawful business would not, and could not, stop with their buyers; and those at the other end knew that it had not begun with their sellers." In *Bruno*, narcotics were smuggled into New York and ultimately sold in Texas and Louisiana as well as in New York. Four groups were involved—the smugglers, the middlemen, and two groups of retailers. The importers could not profitably stay in business without a selling outlet and the reverse was true, for the retailers required a continuing source of supply. Comparison of the facts in *Bruno* with those in the oft-cited case of *United States* v. *Peoni*, 100 F. 2d 401 (2d Cir. 1938), relied on by appellants, shows the inappositeness of the latter. In *Bruno* the evidence sufficed to warrant the jury's finding that defendants

knew remote links must have existed; in *Peoni* it did not. Had the prosecution in *Peoni* been able to establish more than one sale from Peoni to Regno, the inference that Peoni knew that sales beyond his own would be made, and that he thus shared a common purpose with Dorsey as Regno's vendee, might well have been strong enough to warrant submission to the jury. *Kotteakos* v. *United States*, 328 U. S. 750 (1946), where the success of any individual illegal transaction was independent of the success of any other, is sufficiently distinguishable. *Kotteakos* is usually given as the prime example of the so-called "circle" or "wheel" conspiracy, which is not what we are dealing with here. See Note, 57 Colum. L. Rev. 387, 388-89 (1957).

In any event, the test for reversible error, if two conspiracies have been established instead of one, is whether the variance affects substantial rights. Fed. R. Crim. P. 52(a). The material inquiry is not the existence but the prejudicial effect of the variance. While we believe, as we have already stated, that the jury could find there was but one conspiracy, the finding of more than one conspiracy would not result in prejudice to any of the defendants in the case before us. See *Berger* v. *United States*, 295 U. S. 78, 82 (1935). The requirements for sustaining a verdict in which there has been a variance have been met. The several conspiracies, if there had been such, could have been joined in a single indictment or consolidated for a single trial and the conduct of the trial was such that the danger resulting from the admission of evidence not chargeable to any appellant was minimal. See *Blumenthal* v. *United States*, 332 U. S. 539, 559-60 (1947); *Hanis* v. *United*

States, 246 F. 2d 781, 789 (8th Cir. 1957); *Ritter* v. *United States*, 230 F. 2d 324, 328-29 (10th Cir. 1956); *United States* v. *Antonelli Fireworks Co.*, 155 F. 2d 631, 635 (2d Cir.), cert. denied, 329 U. S. 742 (1946); Note, "Developments in the Law of Criminal Conspiracy," 72 Harv. L. Rev. 920, 992 (1959). Again *Kotteakos*, where the prosecution of thirty-two defendants resulted in proof of at least eight separate conspiracies, is inapplicable.

Appellant Palmieri contends that there was insufficient evidence to support his conviction on the conspiracy count. Since we find that his conviction on substantive count 5 of the indictment, for a sale of narcotics on March 21, 1960, was sufficiently supported by the evidence, any discussion of his conspiracy conviction is rendered moot; Judge Herlands imposed concurrent sentences on each count. See *Sinclair* v. *United States*, 279 U. S. 263, 299 (1929); *United States* v. *Mont*, 306 F. 2d 412, 414 (2d Cir. 1962).

EVIDENCE OF NARCOTICS IN THE SUBSTANTIVE COUNTS

It is not necessary, in order for the Government to prove its case of conspiracy to violate the narcotic laws, that there be proof of actual dealings in narcotics. All that need be proved is the unlawful agreement and an overt act committed in pursuance of the agreement. The "conspiracy is a crime in and of itself, separate and apart from the crime of importation, purchase, sale, and transportation of narcotics." *Poliafico* v. *United States*, 237 F. 2d 97, 105 (6th Cir. 1956), cert. denied, 352 U. S. 1025 (1957). Cf. *Braverman* v. *United States*, 317 U. S. 49, 54 (1942); *Pereira* v. *United States*, 347 U. S. 1, 11 (1954). The rule

is otherwise, however, with regard to substantive violations of the narcotics laws; there, the jury must be convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that the substance imported, sold, concealed, or adulterated was in fact a narcotic drug. This element, under the terms of 21 U. S. C. § 174, is requisite to a conviction. But it is not necessary that it be proved by direct evidence. Just as with any other component of the crime, the existence of and dealing with narcotics may be proved by circumstantial evidence; there need be no sample placed before the jury, nor need there be testimony by qualified chemists as long as the evidence furnished ground for inferring that the material in question was narcotics. See *United States* v. *Morello*, 250 F. 2d 631, 633-34 (2d Cir. 1957).

The appellants who have been convicted on substantive counts do not challenge these principles of law. They contend, instead, that the trial judge did not adequately compartmentalize the circumstantial evidence as it was relevant to the proof of narcotics in a particular substantive count charged against a particular defendant. It is contended that the jury was, in essence, instructed that in determining the guilt of one defendant under a substantive count of the indictment, they should weigh evidence relating to other substantive counts, to other defendants, and to transactions in which the particular defendant was not even involved. The judge's instruction is therefore contended to violate the principle laid down in *United States* v. *Bufalino*, 285 F. 2d 408 (2d Cir. 1960), that proof in a mass conspiracy trial must be individualized and compartmentalized, defendant by defendant and count by count.

Appendix A

Evidence admissible to prove only the conspiracy was, it is argued, improperly employed to prove the individual substantive counts.

We hold that Judge Herlands' instructions on the use of circumstantial evidence to determine that the material in question was narcotics in the various substantive counts were adequate. He charged that there were seven categories of circumstantial evidence which the jury might consider in determining whether a given defendant had possession of or had imported the narcotic drug as charged in each substantive count: (1) Rinaldo's testimony that he had personally tested samples of the powder from each shipment; (2) the secrecy and deviousness with which the transactions were handled (*i.e.*, false-bottomed trunks, use of linings in the blankets, code words, etc.); (3) the fact that the substance in which they were dealing was a white powder; (4) the high prices paid in cash for the substance; (5) the lack of complaint on the part of the purchasers; (6) descriptive language used by certain of the defendants in connection with certain transactions; (7) the white powder in evidence which the United States chemist testified was heroin hydrochloride. A conviction on similar evidence was upheld in *Toliver* v. *United States*, 224 F 2d 742, 745 (9th Cir. 1955).

In a trial of this dimension, each juror is faced with a difficult task in compartmentalizing the evidence with regard to each particular defendant and keeping clearly in mind the full circumstances of each transaction. It is the function of the judge, in his instructions to the jurors, to marshal the evidence that they have seen and heard pre-

sented such that justice may be meted out to the individual rather than to the group. Our concept of criminal responsibility, like our concept of moral responsibility, is rooted in the individual, his intentions, his motives, and his conduct. The trial judge, therefore, has the burden of impressing upon the jury the need for judging each defendant separately upon each separate substantive count charged in the indictment. We feel that Judge Herlands patiently and capably performed this task. His instructions to the jury were replete with admonitions that "you must be convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that the substance involved in each of such substantive counts was a narcotic drug . . . ."

That portion of the charge on circumstantial evidence of narcotics most likely to result in harmful side effects to the defendants was the following: "6. The Government claims that its witnesses, Palmeri and Rinaldo, testified as to admissions by *certain* of the defendants that they were dealing with narcotics in connection with *certain* transactions." (Emphasis added.) Even there, the emphasis upon particular defendants in particular transactions is strong. We feel that any possible ambiguity was cured by the passage almost immediately following: "If the evidence convinces you beyond a reasonable doubt that the substance involved in a particular count—and you must consider the evidence count by count—was heroin, you may conclude that this element of the offense charged in particular count has been proved. If, on the other hand, the evidence does not convince you beyond a reasonable doubt that the substance involved in a particular count was heroin, you must find the defendant or defendants named in the particular count

not guilty on that particular count.[8] Reading the charge in its entirety and observing the emphasis which the trial judge placed on the necessary requirements of proof, we cannot agree that the jury was not instructed on the need to compartmentalize the evidence and on the consideration it was to give to the evidence as it applied to each defendant on each substantive count.

The Government further argues that were we to construe Judge Herlands' charge as suggested by the appellants, there was no error, for anything said or done by a conspirator in furtherance of the conspiracy is admissible against every other conspirator, even on a substantive count. This principle of law, they argue, is operative despite the absence of a charge of conspiracy in the indictment. We are referred to *Pinkerton* v. *United States*, 328 U. S. 640, 645-48 (1946), and *United States* v. *Pugliese*, 153 F. 2d 497 (2d Cir. 1945). The appellants reply that the application of principles of agency to the criminal law, see 4 Wigmore, Evidence § 1079 (3d ed. 1940), has been restricted to cases of actual aiding and abetting, to cases of present specific participation in the specific acts which make up the crime charged in the substantive offense; the principles are said not to ex

[8] Earlier in his charge the judge clearly emphasized the need to individualize and compartmentalize when he stated "It is your recollection and your recollection alone that determines whether or not the following items advanced by the Government's contentions prove, with respect to *each* substantive count concerning which the asserted items of proof respectively relate, that the substance was heroin hydrochloride." And in another portion of his charge he stated: "However, with respect to all of the substantive counts, as distinguished from the conspiracy count, you must be convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that the substance involved in *each* of such substantive counts was a narcotic drug * * *" (Emphasis added).

tend to cases of broad-ranging conspiracy. Since we have held that Judge Herlands adequately compartmentalized the evidence with regard to the substantive offenses of the individual defendants, we are not required to determine whether each item of evidence could not properly be considered against each conspirator under the rule of law advanced by the Government.

Appellant's final attack upon the proof that the material was narcotics addresses itself to the sufficiency of the evidence on this phase of the case. We reject this argument, for we find the evidence introduced to establish that the material in question in the substantive counts was narcotics to be quite convincing. All the narcotics referred to in those counts went through the hands of Rinaldo, who testified that he tested a sample from each shipment, except the last, and found narcotics each time. The last shipment, as well as samples from some earlier shipments which Rinaldo had hidden in his home, were tested by United States Government chemists and found to be narcotics. The appellants contend that Rinaldo's tests—change of color upon the addition of nitric acid and liquification upon heating the powder to between 230°C and 240°C—were insufficient to prove that the substance was narcotics. They urge that other chemical tests must be performed before the substance can definitively be determined to be narcotics. But surely there was sufficient evidence, albeit not conclusive to a mathematical certainty, to warrant a reasonable inference to that effect. The Government need not exclude every remote possibility of innocence before its case warrants submission to the jury. See *Holland* v. *United States*, 348 U. S. 121, 139-40 (1954);

Appendix A

United States v. *Tutino*, 269 F. 2d 488, 490 (2d Cir. 1959).

INSTRUCTIONS ON DEFENDANT'S PRIVILEGE NOT TO TESTIFY

Appellant Tandler did not take the stand during the course of the trial. Judge Herlands, in summarizing the defense theories and contentions offered on behalf of defendants Shiffman and Tandler, instructed the jury as follows:

> "Now the defendant Shiffman took the stand. The defendant Tandler did not take the stand. The fact that the defendant Tandler did not take the stand does not give rise to any presumption or inference against him or adverse to him. As you know, under the Constitution, Fifth Amendment, no defendant in a criminal case can be compelled to be a witness against himself; and that means that in a criminal case a defendant has the prerogative and privilege not to testify, and the fact that he does not testify does not in any way, directly or indirectly, permit you to draw any inference adverse to the defendant. A defendant has the right to rely on his presumption of innocence and to put the Government to its proof."

At the conclusion of Judge Herlands' instructions, Tandler's attorney excepted to the language in this passage referring to the Fifth Amendment and to the privilege against self-incrimination. It is argued by Tandler, and by appellants Lo Bue, Palmeri, and Valachi, who also chose not to testify, that a reference to the Fifth Amendment, in an era when it is said resort to that amendment creates an indisputably unfavorable inference, was prejudicial and constituted reversible error. While most likely it would have been better if the judge had not mentioned the Fifth Amend-

ment, his statement, in the context of the passage quoted above and also of the supplemental charge he later gave in response to an objection by Tandler's counsel, was not reversible error.

At common law, the accused in an ordinary criminal prosecution could not be called as a witness in his own behalf, because under the rules governing litigation until the middle of the last century, he was deemed "incompetent" to testify at all. This incapacity pre-existed the drafting of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. The accused's incapacity to testify in a federal court was removed in 1878 by what is now Title 18 U.S.C. § 3481: "In trials of all persons charged with the commission of offenses against the United States * * * the person charged shall, at his own request, be a competent witness. His failure to make such request shall not create any presumption against him." It is therefore usually assumed that the constitutional provisions, "though not at all necessary, when adopted, to guard the accused against being called, were intended to preserve that result of the incompetency from being abrogated by legislation." McCormick, Evidence, § 122 at 257 (1954). The outstanding authority on evidence likewise treats the constitutional privilege against self-incrimination as the modern-day foundation for the accused's privilege not to take the stand. See 8 Wigmore, Evidence, §§ 2251 at 296, 2268 at 406 (McNaughton Rev. 1961). We believe therefore that it was *factually* proper for Judge Herlands to charge as he did regarding defendant Tandler's failure to take the stand.

Appellant Tandler has made an effort to distort the judge's instruction into an "unfavorable comment", call-

ing to our attention several cases stating the rule that a conviction should be reversed if the court comments unfavorably on the failure of an accused to testify. *Quercia* v. *United States*, 289 U. S. 466, 471-72 (1933); *Allison* v. *United States*, 160 U. S. 203, 209 (1895). We find these cases completely inapposite. It is patently contrived to argue that Judge Herlands was commenting unfavorably when in the very same passage to which objection is taken he charged twice that the jurors were forbidden to draw any adverse inferences; he also explained that the defendant has a right to rely on his presumption of innocence and to put the Government to its proof. In so doing, Judge Herlands' charge could be construed as even more favorable to Tandler than it was to the other coconspirators who likewise chose to rest upon their privilege not to testify.

Finally, in response to an exception by Tandler's counsel, Judge Herlands gave this supplemental instruction to the jury: "The legal theory for this rule is immaterial so far as you are concerned but the important and vital point for you as jurors in this case to bear in mind is that a defendant has the unqualified right not to take the stand, and you may not in any manner draw any inference against the defendant because he did not take the stand." We have held before that a clear instruction of this character may cure any prejudice resulting from an unfavorable comment, if such there was. See *United States* v. *Stromberg*, supra, at 271; *United States* v. *Di Carlo*, 64 F. 2d 15 (2d Cir., 1933); *United States* v. *De Vasto*, 52 F. 2d 26 (2d Cir.), cert. denied, 284 U. S. 678 (1931). The court's instruction was historically correct and, we find, could not

have been prejudicial, especially in the context of this long trial. See *United States* v. *Stromberg*, *supra*, at 271.

ALLEGED PREJUDICIAL NEWSPAPER PUBLICITY

One month after the opening of the trial, the New York press reported the violent slaying of Albert Agueci, one of the members of the so-called executive group. The victim, brother of appellant Vito Agueci, was a fugitive from justice at the time. Several of the jurors either read of the incident, heard about it through radio or television, or heard it discussed in the jury room. The news stories stated no reason for the death of the victim, but merely indicated that another defendant had been found dead some months before the trial, and that the brother of the slain man, Vito, was on trial for violation of the narcotics laws.

Immediately upon learning of the publicity, Judge Herlands conducted an extensive *voir dire* of the jury, questioning with great care each juror who had heard of the incident. In response to the questioning, the jurors assured the court that nothing seen or heard would affect their deliberations or ability to render a fair verdict. Throughout the *voir dire* examination, Judge Herlands repeatedly made it clear that a fair and impartial trial was essential, that it would be necessary to excuse the jurors if their judgment were prejudiced or unduly influenced by the publicity, and that the case was to be decided only on the basis of evidence presented in the courtroom. This last admonition was repeated in the closing instructions to the jury.

We hold that the nature of the publicity was such that, when conjoined with the trial judge's cautionary instructions, no prejudice resulted to defendant Vito Agueci or to his codefendants.

"The crux of the matter is whether the statements were so prejudicial as to require the trial judge, who has large discretion in such matters, * * * to empanel a new jury." *United States* v. *Feldman*, 229 F. 2d 914, 917 (2d Cir. 1962). In those cases in which newspaper publicity was deemed so prejudicial as to warrant reversal and an order for a new trial, the reports contained information regarding such obviously inflammatory and inadmissible matter as the prior criminal record of the defendant, see, e.g., *Marshall* v. *United States*, 360 U. S. 310 (1959), or clearly incriminatory out-of-court conduct, see, e.g., *United States* v. *Leviton*, 193 F. 2d 848 (2d Cir. 1951), cert. denied, 343 U. S. 946 (1952). Another matter of no small consequence which influenced the disposition of the cases cited to us on behalf of the appellants was the instrumental role of the Government in bringing the adverse publicity to light. See *United States* v. *Leviton*, *supra*; *Delaney* v. *United States*, 199 F. 2d 107, 112-14 (1st Cir. 1952). Certainly these categories are not all-inclusive, but the fact that the information disclosed by the publicity here was not centered upon any particular one of the appellants, did not refer to prior illicit conduct, and did not emanate from the Government but was a matter of general public knowledge, convinces us that the appellants' right to a fair and impartial trial was not impaired.

The typical jury, in this age of mass-communications, is not hermetically sealed from the events occurring all about

them. Of course, an effort must be made by the trial judge to caution jurors against considering extra-judicial statements pertinent to the guilt or innocence of the individuals upon whom they sit in judgment. Where the cautionary instructions are adequate, as they were here, and where the news reporting was merely routine and hardly inflammatory, the trial judge does not abuse his discretion by refusing to declare a mistrial. See *United States* v. *Stromberg*, *supra*, at 269-70; *United States* v. *Postma*, 242 F. 2d 488, 495 (2d Cir.), cert. denied, 354 U. S. 922 (1957); *United State* v. *Allied Stevedoring Corp.*, 241 F. 2d 925, 935 (2d Cir), cert. denied, 353 U. S. 984 (1957). "Trial by newspaper may be unfortunate, but it is not new and, unless the court accepts the standard judicial hypothesis that cautioning instructions are effective, criminal trials in the large metropolitan centers may well prove impossible." *United States* v. *Leviton*, 193 F. 2d at 857.

These same considerations govern our disposition of the appellants' contention that prejudice was caused by a news story relating the fact that Judge Herlands, during the course of the trial, revoked the bail of the defendants and remanded them to jail. Of the three jurors who heard of this publicity, one had merely been told that there was an article about the trial judge in the newspaper, one had seen the headline but put the article aside as soon as he realized that it related to the case on trial, and one was an alternate juror who did not participate in the jury's deliberations. There is obviously no merit to this contention.

Appendix A

Other Points Raised in Behalf of All Defendants

Further issues are raised which pertain to several or all of the defendants. These can be disposed of within briefer compass.

The great preponderance of testimony offered on behalf of the Government was that of Matteo Palmeri and Salvatore Rinaldo, two of the former members of the conspiracy. Their testimony was corroborated in certain respects by immigrants who had brought the valises and trunks to this country, by Government agents, by two individuals living in Garfield, New Jersey, who testified to the slip-up at the pier in early September of 1960, and by various documents, such as baggage manifests and passenger lists. It is contended that the evidence against at least one defendant, Luigi Lo Bue, rests solely upon the testimony of coconspirator Matteo Palmeri. It is therefore suggested that we ought to review the federal rule that the uncorroborated testimony of an accomplice is sufficient to convict. We hold, however, that the long-standing federal rule does not require modification. See *Caminetti* v. *United States*, 242 U. S. 470, 495 (1917); *United States* v. *Moran*, 151 F. 2d 661 (2d Cir. 1945); *United States* v. *Schwartz*, 150 F. 2d 627 (2d Cir.), cert. denied, 326 U. S. 757 (1945); *United States* v. *Quinn*, 124 F. 2d 378 (2d Cir. 1941); *United States* v. *Gallo*, 123 F. 2d 229 (2d Cir. 1941). Especially is this principle appropriate in narcotics conspiracy cases, where tangible evidence is often quickly sold or easily destroyed and where conduct and contacts are always furtive. The efficient administration of these vital federal laws could be hampered beyond repair if testimony from

the individuals who know most about the illicit activity was insufficient to sustain a conviction of their co-conspirators. We therefore hold that the circumstance that the chief Government witnesses were formerly members of the conspiracy is a matter which goes merely to the weight of their testimony. Certainly the jury should be carefully instructed as to the weight properly given to "the uncorroborated testimony, inconsistent with his earlier testimony in some respects, of an accomplice and co-conspirator who had the strongest possible reasons to become a Government witness." See *United States* v. *Persico*, 305 F. 2d 534, 536 (2d Cir. 1962). Judge Herlands' instruction to the jury was more than adequate on this score. He stated, "The testimony of Palmeri and Rinaldo, who are accomplices by their own admission, must, as a matter of law, be considered by you with close and searching scrutiny and caution." See *Bishop* v. *United States*, 243 F. 2d 32 (D. C. Cir. 1957).

Appellants contend also that the grand and petit juries were improperly selected, and that a motion to dismiss the indictment and a challenge to the array of the petit jury were improperly disposed of by the trial court. Jury lists in the Southern District of New York were drawn in this case from lists of persons registered to vote at presidential elections in the counties of New York, Bronx and Westchester. The contention that this method of selection excludes a legally cognizable group from jury service has been exhaustively treated and completely repudiated in the considered opinion of Judge Bryan in *United States* v. *Greenberg*, 200 F. Supp. 382 (S. D. N. Y. 1961). The quali-

fications for federal jury service set down in 28 U. S. C. § 1861[9] are strikingly similar to the requirements for voter registration in the state of New York, see *United States* v. *Greenberg*, *supra*, at 389; the cross-section of society represented by those registration lists is so extensive as to render frivolous the assertion of systematic exclusion. See also *Dow* v. *Carnegie-Illinois Steel Corp.*, 224 F. 2d 414 (3d Cir. 1955), cert. denied, 350 U. S. 971 (1956); *United States* v. *Flynn*, 216 F. 2d 354 (2d Cir. 1954), cert. denied, 348 U. S. 909 (1955).

Finally, the appellants as a group contend that the arrest of Rinaldo and Palmeri on October 21, 1960 and the seizure of the narcotics in the false-bottomed trunk, were brought about by information obtained through a wiretap by Westchester County police authorities and transmitted to agents of the federal narcotics bureau. The evidence thus obtained is alleged to be "fruit of the poisonous tree", which has been handed on a "silver platter" from the state to the federal authorities. This contention was asserted below, and Judge Herlands quite properly held an extensive hearing to determine whether the information secured by the state agents through wiretapping had been trans-

---

[9] "Any citizen of the United States who has attained the age of twenty-one years, and who has resided for one year within the judicial district, is competent to serve as a grand or petit juror unless—

(1) He has been convicted in a State or Federal court of record of a crime punishable by imprisonment for more than one year and his civil rights have not been restored by pardon or amnesty.

(2) He is unable to read, write, speak and understand the English language.

(3) He is incapable, by reason of mental or physical infirmities to render efficient jury service."

mitted to or used by the federal agents in any fashion whatsoever. He concluded that federal authorities "neither received nor used any wiretapping evidence or information derived from the Westchester County authorities or from any other local authorities" and that "the record * * * overwhelmingly supports and sustains the prosecution's contentions." We hold that his conclusions are amply supported by the evidence and are not clearly erroneous. Not only did the state officers sedulously avoid communicating wiretap information to the federal narcotics agents because of a consciousness that such evidence would pollute a federal prosecution, but the record shows that no evidence in any way pertinent to the case at hand was turned up by the taps. Once the defendants offered evidence of the existence of the wiretap, it was incumbent upon the Government to prove that its evidence was not tainted by the tap. *United States* v. *Caplon*, 185 F. 2d 629, 636 (2d Cir. 1950). The Government clearly satisfied this burden; it was not necessary to go further and disclose the precise source from which its information did come.[9a]

Moreover, there is no merit to the appellants' contention that documents containing prior statements by Government witness Rinaldo were improperly used on redirect examination. They fall within the rule of "verbal completeness," and were properly used to place in context state-

---

[9a] The Government did, in fact, introduce testimony that it had independently secured evidence against members of the conspiracy well before the date of the state wiretap. On September 8, 1960, federal narcotics agent Brown purchased almost $4000 worth of narcotics from Maiello, one of the co-conspirators. The state wiretapping commenced on September 23, and the cooperation of state and federal agents regarding Rinaldo's activities commenced in early October.

ments made on cross-examination. See *United States* v. *Lev*, 276 F. 2d 605, 608 (2d Cir.), cert. denied, 363 U. S. 812 (1960); *United States* v. *Apuzzo*, 245 F. 2d 416, 421-22 (2d Cir.) (en banc), cert. denied, 355 U. S. 831 (1957); 7 Wigmore, Evidence §§ 2094, 2115 (3d ed. 1940); McCormick, Evidence 132 (1954). Also without merit is the contention that the trial judge's entry into the jury room—*with the consent of all counsel*—to inform the jurors that they may leave for lunch, was prejudicial and constituted reversible error. It is undesirable that any information not presented in the courtroom should reach a jury after it has commenced its deliberations, except in those rare instances where all concerned—counsel and the judge—agree that a written communication to the jurors is preferable to bringing them back into the courtroom. But in this instance the judge decided, with everyone's consent, to communicate personally the innocuous message to the jurors. We believe that it would have been wiser had he not, but that it would be "the merest pedantry" to deem his conduct, under the circumstances present here, in any manner prejudicial to the appellants. See *United States* v. *Compagna*, 146 F. 2d 524 (2d Cir. 1944), cert. denied, 324 U. S. 867 (1945).

II.

Having disposed of those grounds urged for reversal which would affect most or all of the appellants, we proceed to the arguments raised by particular defendants in their own behalf.

Appendix A

Cottone's Conspiracy Conviction

Filippo Cottone was indicted and convicted under the conspiracy count of the indictment; he was not charged with any substantive violation of 21 U. S. C. § 174, which proscribes, among other things, facilitating "the transportation, concealment, or sale" of a narcotic drug knowing it to have been imported. Cottone's sole connection with the conspiracy was the assistance he rendered to Matteo Palmeri on September 6 or 7, 1960, when Palmeri was unable to use his bakery truck to pick up the false-bottomed trunk waiting at Pier 84. The Government's case against Cottone may be briefly summarized.

Albert Agueci had told Palmeri that in the event his truck was ever out of order he should contact Cottone. Palmeri did so, informed Cottone that he needed his assistance to pick up a trunk containing narcotics,[10] and promised him $300 for his help. Cottone accompanied Palmeri to the pier, Palmeri signed for the trunk, and both of them loaded it into Cottone's station wagon. En route to Palmeri's bakery, Cottone made the following comments: "You never had any trouble before. How come you all messed up this time? Like your truck is not in order, and you can't find the passenger and all this trouble. I just can't understand how you people operate. It is like a mess." At the bakery, Cottone was introduced to Rinaldo as a man who was "all right"; this was in response to Rinaldo's query whether Mauro and Caruso knew that Palmeri was

[10] On cross-examination he testified that he told Cottone "The trunk contains narcotic (sic) on the double bottom of the trunk, so when the inspector opens the trunk we shouldn't worry about nothing."

"taking another man." Cottone participated in ripping open the false-bottom of the trunk, which contained packages of heroin. Cottone left the baker with one of the blankets taken from the trunk after all of the packages of heroin had supposedly been extracted. When Palmeri later ascertained that there were still three kilograms of heroin in the lining of the blanket, he informed Cottone of this fact and retrieved the blanket. Cottone received the $300 promised him for his services.

We hold that the evidence clearly sustains Cottone's conviction on the conspiracy count. From the testimony summarized above, the jury could have readily inferred that Cottone knew that he was assisting Palmeri in a transaction involving narcotics. But it is urged that although Cottone may have known that the substance imported was narcotics there was insufficient proof from which a jury could conclude that he was aware that the scope of the conspiracy was larger than his instant participation and that there were more conspirators involved. This argument is grounded primarily upon the fact that Cottone was implicated in a single transaction involving only two other individuals.

Several cases decided by this court have held that proof of participation in a single isolated narcotics transaction may be insufficient to warrant a conviction for conspiracy. See *United States* v. *Aviles*, 274 F. 2d 179, 190 (2d Cir.), cert. denied, 362 U. S. 974 (1960); *United States* v. *Stromberg*, 268 F. 2d 256, 267 (2d Cir.), cert. denied, 361 U. S. 863 (1959); *United States* v. *Reina*, 242 F. 2d 302, 306 (2d Cir.), cert. denied, 354 U. S. 913 (1957); *United States* v.

Koch, 113 F. 2d 982 (2d Cir. 1940). But, these cases also make it clear that the so-called single-transaction rule is not an arbitrary rule which is to be applied rigidly and without reason. It has been utilized to exonerate a defendant only when there is no independent evidence tending to prove that the defendant had some knowledge of the broader conspiracy and when the single transaction is not in itself one from which such knowledge might be inferred. "A single act may be the foundation for drawing the actor within the ambit of a conspiracy * * *. But, since conviction of conspiracy requires an intent to participate in the unlawful enterprise, the single act must be such that one may reasonably infer from it such an intent." *United States* v. *Aviles*, 274 F. 2d at 189. We hold that there is independent evidence from which Cottone's knowledge of the overall conspiracy may be inferred, for he was introduced by Palmeri to Rinaldo, was recommended to Palmeri by Albert Agueci for assistance in these particular circumstances, and was present when Rinaldo referred to Mauro and Caruso. Furthermore, his conversation en route from the pier to the bakery revealed that he was an old hand in the conspiratorial operation; so too did his criticism of Palmeri for failing to locate the passenger bringing in the trunk despite the fact that Palmeri had never mentioned any such passenger to him.

We need not rest on such particularized pieces of evidence, for we further believe that a jury could reasonably infer from the nature of this single transaction itself that Cottone had knowledge of the conspiracy. He went to Pier 84 to assist in procuring a trunk which he knew to

contain narcotics; surely he must have known that the trunk had been imported. He helped to tear open the bottom of the trunk containing blankets in which ten kilograms of narcotics had been secreted. He must have known that such a large quantity of narcotics had not reached their resting place, and the inference is again inescapable that he knew that they would soon be distributed to other illicit purchasers. It was under similar circumstances that this Court found sufficient evidence to support the conspiracy conviction in *United States* v. *Bruno*, 105 F. 2d 921 (2d Cir.), rev'd on other grounds, 308 U. S. 287 (1939).

We have recently held that "From evidence of knowledge of the conspiracy and a transaction with one of its members it would be reasonable to infer intent to participate in it * * *." *United States* v. *Aviles*, 274 F. 2d at 190. We hold that there was ample evidence to support Cottone's conviction on the conspiracy count.

PROSECUTOR'S REMARKS IN SUMMATION

Cottone argues that there is still another ground for reversing his conviction. He charges that he was prejudiced by the improper insinuation made in the prosecutor's summation that the lawyer representing both Cottone and Scopellitti had been instrumental in suborning their false testimony. Prior to the trial, Mr. Lewis, who was Cottone's attorney, was requested by the court also to represent the indigent defendant Scopellitti. This he agreed to do. Before this, both Cottone and Scopellitti had made pretrial statements. Their testimony at trial, however, was different

from those statements, and both erected a similar defense.[11] The Government prosecutor, in calling these facts to the attention of the jury, stated:

> "* * * because that is what they told us before, wouldn't you think or you might assume that they are going to give basically the same story again? But then what happened? They are both represented by Mr. Lewis. Both of them take the stand and both of them have almost identical defenses. * * * What a coincidence that is, too * * *."

It is contended that the remark was so prejudicial to both Cottone and Scopellitti that a mistrial should have been ordered and that, on appeal, the defendants' convictions should be reversed.

There is no doubt that the prosecutor's thinly veiled accusation of subornation of perjury on the part of Mr. Lewis was irregular and improper. It would have been appropriate for the trial judge to intercede *sua sponte* in order to caution the jury to ignore the prosecutor's remarks. Such a remark by the prosecutor might, in a case where the evidence against the particular defendants was very tenuous, have caused enough prejudice to be thrust upon the scales of justice, such that they would be tipped

[11] In his pretrial statement, Cottone denied that he had been at Pier 84 in his car during 1960. Scopellitti, in his statement, said that he had brought only two valises containing personal clothing when he returned to this country. At the trial, both denied material facts contained in those statements and offered exculpatory defenses. Each admitted that he had been at the pier. Cottone said that he had been there merely to help Palmeri pick up a trunk, the contents of which were unknown to him. Scopellitti testified that he had in fact brought a valise and a trunk from Italy, the latter as a favor for a friend, and that he was unaware of the narcotics concealed in the false bottom of the trunk.

onto the side of conviction; we would then be constrained to reverse and order a new trial. But, although we disapprove of the prosecuting attorney's remarks, we feel that the evidence in support of Cottone's conspiracy conviction was strong enough, and this isolated incident not sufficiently prejudicial in the context of this long trial, see *United States* v. *Stromberg*, *supra*, at 271, to warrant a reversal.

In reaching our conclusion, we further note that although Mr. Lewis, after the entire summation was completed on December 22, 1961, approached the bench "on a point of personal privilege" to ask that the prosecutor's attack be referred to the bar association, there was at that time no formal objection or suggestion that the portion of the summation in question affected the rights of his clients. Nor was a motion then made for a mistrial. Specifically, Mr. Lewis objected to what he considered to be a slur upon his personal integrity. Had a corrective charge been requested, it is likely that one would have been given promptly, for the trial judge was accommodating in that respect—as witness his supplemental instruction regarding the right of the defendants not to take the stand; but no such request was made.

The trial judge instructed all counsel on December 22 to submit in memorandum form on the next trial date, December 26, any motions, objections, or exceptions to the day's proceedings. It is significant that it was not until the latter date that counsel for Cottone and Scopellitti attempted to articulate that the prosecutor's summation was prejudicial to his clients. What must have been confusing to the trial judge, however, was the fact that counsel's written objection (Court's Exhibit XVIII) still appeared

to be mainly concerned with correcting the unwarranted attack on his professional honor. Much the greater part of his objection was directed to the effect which he believed the prosecutor's comments had upon his standing at the bar. The first sentence of the objection asked for a withdrawal of a juror and the declaration of a mistrial "because of the scurrilous attack made upon counsel"; counsel urged in the alternative that if the mistrial be denied the case should be reopened so that he might prove his many years of devotion to and respect at the bar. He coupled this with a request that the prosecutor's accusations be presented to a grand jury and if untrue that they be called to the attention of Chief Judge Lumbard for disciplinary action. He concluded his written objection with the following statement: "This Court is urged to take the necessary steps to inquire into the truth of the prosecutor's remarks so that counsel's good name and his standing as an honorable member of the bar be preserved." It is significant that, despite the formalization of his objection in the written memorandum of December 26, counsel did not even then seek a corrective charge. The judge charged the jury shortly after these objections were voiced. He could with little difficulty have given a corrective charge had counsel requested it and had he not distracted the judge by demands for an investigation of his conduct by the bar association, the grand jury, and the Chief Judge. We are agreed that had a proper corrective charge been given, counsel would have no cause to complain here. See *United States* v. *Stromberg*, 268 F. 2d 256, 271 (2d Cir.), cert denied, 361 U. S. 863 (1959). We should not reward him for his failure to make this request.

In any event, we choose to reject the assertion of error for the reason that, while the prosecutor's remarks were improper, we do not think they were so prejudicial as to require a new trial. Cf. *United States* v. *Greenberg*, 268 F. 2d 120, 123-124 (2d Cir. 1959); *United States* v. *De Fillo*, 257 F. 2d 835, 840 (2d Cir. 1958), cert. denied, 359 U. S. 945 (1959); *Williams* v. *United States*, 265 F. 2d 214, 216-17 (9th Cir. 1959).

Appellant Scopellitti joins in urging that this incident was prejudicial to him as well, especially, he says, in light of allegedly insufficient evidence to support a finding that he had knowledge that narcotics were contained in the trunk he brought to this country on August 10, 1960. He admits, *arguendo*, to knowledge of the smuggling operation and the false-bottomed trunks, but contends that there is no proof that he knew the substance smuggled was narcotics rather than some other material. We cannot agree. Palmeri testified that Scopellitti and Rinaldo broke open the bottom of the trunk Scopellitti brought to this country and extracted ten packages of narcotics; Scopellitti had earlier reassured his colleagues, "don't worry. I know what it's all about." We hold that the evidence was sufficient to support Scopellitti's convictions for conspiracy and the substantive importation violation of the narcotics law; and, for the reasons already stated, that the prosecutor's attack upon the defendant's counsel did not warrant reversal.

Appendix A

VALACHI'S PURPORTED WITHDRAWAL FROM THE CONSPIRACY

Appellant Valachi was convicted on the conspiracy count only. Midway during the conspiracy, on March 28, 1960, he surrendered himself to the United States Attorney for the Eastern District of New York on another violation. He contends that this constituted withdrawal from the conspiracy as a matter of law, and therefore that the trial judge erred in denying his motion for a severance, his request to instruct the jury to disregard as to him the acts and declarations of his co-conspirators after his incarceration, and his motion for a special verdict on the issue of Valachi's withdrawal.

Even if it were true that Valachi's incarceration terminated his relationship to the conspiracy as a matter of law, it is doubtful that the denial of his motion to be tried separately would be reversible error. Under Rule 14 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, "If it appears that a defendant * * * is prejudiced by a joinder of offenses or of defendants in an indictment * * * or by such joinder for trial together, the court may order an election or separate trials of counts, grant a severance of defendants or provide whatever other relief justice requires." We could not hold that the prejudice to Valachi caused by a joint trial with several co-conspirators would, under the circumstances of his case, where we believe an overall conspiracy has been established, make it an abuse of discretion for Judge Herlands to refuse to sever. See *Schaffer* v. *United States*, 362 U. S. 511 (1960). There was substantial evidence of Valachi's participation in the conspiracy prior to his incarceration, and the significance of

his withdrawal relates only to the improper use against him of subsequent acts and declarations of co-conspirators. Cf. *Cleaver* v. *United States*, 238 F. 2d 766 (10th Cir. 1956).

The law is clear, however, that while arrest or incarceration *may* constitute a withdrawal from a conspiracy, it does not follow that in every instance it *must*. On facts almost identical to those before us, the Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit recently held that the defendant's participation in the conspiracy was not terminated. See *Poliafico* v. *United States*, 237 F. 2d 97 (1956), cert denied, 352 U. S. 1025 (1957). See also *Pinkerton* v. *United States*, 328 U. S. 640, 646-47 (1946). Here, not only was there no conclusive evidence of Valachi's affirmative withdrawal from the conspiracy, see *Hyde* v. *United States*, 225 U. S. 347, 369 (1912); *United States* v. *Stromberg*, *supra*, *United States* v. *Cohen*, 145 F. 2d 82, 90 (2d Cir. 1944), cert. denied, 323 U. S. 799 (1945); *Marino* v. *United States*, 91 F. 2d 691 (9th Cir. 1937), but there was positive evidence that Valachi had in fact designated Porcelli, Guippone, and others to look after his interest in the conspiracy after his incarceration. Since Valachi was to get a share in the profits made on sales by those co-conspirators, there is little question but that he continued to have a stake in the success of the venture.

Certainly the jury could have disbelieved this evidence and found that Valachi had in fact withdrawn from the conspiracy; if he had, then subsequent acts and declarations of coconspirators could not be used against him and he could not be responsible for the acts committed by his colleagues in furtherance of the conspiracy. *Pinkerton*

v. *United States, supra.* An instruction to this effect was given[12] and was sufficient to guard against prejudice. While Judge Herlands could, in his discretion, have ordered a special verdict on this issue, it was not an abuse of discretion to refuse to do so.

Repeated Assertion of Privilege Against Self-Incrimination by Porcelli.

Appellant Porcelli took the stand in his own defense in order to establish that his dealings with Government witness Rinaldo were not related to any narcotics conspiracy but solely to certain gambling ventures. On cross-examination the prosecutor sought to probe further into the coincidence that these alleged gambling activities would have taken place during the same period as the charged conspiracy; he therefore asked Porcelli whether he engaged in those activities during the years just prior to the period covered in the indictment. To the prosecutor's questions whether he was in the "gambling business" in the years 1959, 1958, and 1957, Porcelli replied that he did not know or did not remember. After a discussion at the bench, the prosecutor reiterated the question regarding the year 1958 and, upon advice of counsel, Porcelli asserted his privilege against self-incrimination. The prosecutor, in a series of seventeen questions, put the same query to Porcelli for the years 1957 back through 1941. Each time, the witness

---

[12] "* * * if you find that the conspiracy so far concerns Valachi terminated on March 28, 1960, when he was remanded, then and in the event that you so find, any evidence introduced during the trial as to acts, conversations and declarations by other alleged co-conspirators, which occurred after March 28, 1960, should not be considered by you against Valachi."

asserted his privilege against self-incrimination. It is argued on appeal that the prejudice caused by this episode warrants reversal of Porcelli's conviction.

We believe that, although this general thread of questioning might have been relevant in view of Porcelli's direct testimony, the prosecutor's tactics on cross-examination were improper. It is true that the prosecutor was justified in probing the truth of Porcelli's claim that his gambling activities were coincident with the period of the conspiracy, especially in light of Porcelli's halting responses to the first in the string of questions. This was information bearing not only on the factual issues being tried but also on Porcelli's credibility. But questions regarding the earliest years, if answered, would at best have elicited information remote in time from the period of the indictment. Furthermore, it became obvious that Porcelli's response to each ensuing question was certain to be an assertion of privilege. But, no objection was made during the course of the questioning and, especially in the absence of any significant showing of prejudice, we feel that the appellant should be precluded from raising this issue for the first time on appeal. "The victim of alleged prejudice cannot be allowed to nurse it along to the point of reversibility and then take advantage of a situation which by his silence he has helped to create." *United States* v. *Five Cases*, 179 F. 2d 519, 523 (2d Cir.), cert. denied, 339 U. S. 963 (1950).

We find appellants' other contentions to be without merit.

Appendix A

III.

This mass-conspiracy case, in presenting us with a great number of difficult problems arising in the course of two months of trial, and in which the record consumed almost 8000 pages, is not untypical of many cases that have come before this Court in the past. It is, therefore, in order for us to concern ourselves with a recurrent feature of this class of case, a feature which often goes undiscussed in judicial opinions. The trial of these multiple-defendant conspiracy cases poses a great problem for the district judge. We recognize that if a narcotics conspiracy is of such dimension as to include a confusing array of defendants, it is inherent in the nature of the crime that the trial is certain to be rather protracted. The great problem confronting the district judge is therefore one of trial management. The jury must constantly be made aware of the fact that there are separate individuals on trial and that each must be judged solely on the evidence properly admissible against him. The difficulties of compartmentalizing the independent evidence in the mass-conspiracy case, and of focussing the attention of the jury on that evidence before consideration may be given to hearsay, are so manifest that we would labor the point were we to say more. But we should call attention to these problems, for in the Southern District of New York there has been a disconcerting increase in the number of indictments and trials involving the mass conspiracy. Judges there are confined for months on end, engaged in trying these cases.

The solution to these problems of judicial administration of the criminal law which we recognize to be difficult

to find, is largely in the hands of the United States Attorney, for he is in a position in the first instance to determine whether it would be more in the interests of criminal justice to restrict the number of defendants tried at any one time. If such were done, then it would be possible to minimize the harassing problems arising from the participation of the great number of separate counsel representing individual defendants, each pursuing his own course in seeking the acquittal of his client. Each counsel, understandably in the mass-conspiracy case, makes a determined effort—which sometimes unfortunately shades into a misguided effort—to distinguish his client from other defendents on trial; he often duplicates matter covered by other counsel, prolongs cross-examination by repetitiveness, becomes more vigorous in his trial demeanor than might ordinarily be proper, and becomes unduly adamant about trial technicalities. Of course the trial judge has a wide discretion to limit needlessly repetitive cross-examination either by the same counsel or by successive counsel and he also may curtail examination which is of doubtful relevance. Some of the cross-examination in this case went beyond the bounds of any possible need and served only to waste the time of the court and the jury. We have observed that these trials do not always steer a staight course toward the determination of innocence or guilt, but are rather excursions into tangential issues, characterized by many side bar hearings, disruption of the flow of evidence, and other time consuming tactics. These only add to the extraordinary hardship of the lay juror who, usually at great inconvenience, takes weeks or months away from his ordinary pursuits in order to fulfil his civic responsibility of jury serv

ice. We recognize that the defense of an accused in a mass-conspiracy case is a difficult task, but we are certain that the task can be performed with the dignity that brings credit to the judicial process. We remind counsel in such cases that while their task requires them to be partisan they are officers of the court and as such are expected to aid the judge in demonstrating that a trial in an American court is indeed an orderly search for the truth.

It is therefore the responsibility of all concerned in the class of case before us—the trial judge, the United States Attorney, defendants' counsel—to make every effort to resolve the great problems that are raised in this perhaps most difficult area of criminal law administration.

The judgments of conviction as to all of the defendants are hereby affirmed.

APPENDIX B

Constitutional Provisions

AMENDMENT 5, UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION.

"No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Militia, when in actual service in time of War or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation."

Statutes Involved

Title 21, United States Code.

"173. IMPORTATION OF NARCOTIC DRUGS PROHIBITED; EXCEPTIONS; CRUDE OPIUM FOR MANUFACTURE OF HEROIN; FORFEITURES.

"It is unlawful to import or bring any narcotic drugs into the United States or any territory under its control or jurisdiction; except that such amounts of crude opium or coca leaves as the board finds to be necessary to provide for medical and legitimate uses only, may be imported and brought into the United States or such territory under such regulations as the board shall prescribe, but no crude opium may be imported or brought in for the purpose of manufacturing heroin. All narcotic drugs

imported under such regulations shall be subject to the duties which are now or may hereafter be imposed upon such drugs when imported.

Any narcotic drug imported or brought into the United States or any territory under its control or jurisdiction, contrary to law, shall (1) if smoking opium or opium prepared for smoking, be seized and summarily forfeited to the United States Government without the necessity of instituting forfeiture proceedings of any character; or (2) if any other narcotic drug, be seized and forfeited to the United States Government, without regard to its value, in the manner provided by sections 514 and 515 of Title 19, or the provisions of law hereafter enacted which are amendatory of, or in substitution for, such sections. Any narcotic drug which is forfeited in a proceeding for condemnation or not claimed under such sections, or which is summarily forfeited as provided in this subdivision shall be placed in the custody of the board and in its discretion be destroyed or delivered to some agency of the United States Government for use for medical or scientific purposes (Feb. 9, 1909, c. 100, 2, 35 Stat. 614; Jan. 17, 1914, c. 9, 38 Stat. 275; May 26, 1922, c. 202, 1, 42 Stat. 596; June 7, 1924, c. 352, 43 Stat. 657."

"174. SAME; PENALTY; EVIDENCE.

Whoever, fraudulently or knowingly, imports or brings any narcotic drug into the United States or any territory under its control or jurisdiction, contrary to law, or receives, conceals, buys, sells, or in any manner facilitates the transportation, con-

cealment, or sale of any such narcotic drug after being imported or brought into the United States contrary to law, or conspires to commit any of such acts in violation of the laws of the United States, shall be imprisoned, not less than five or more than twenty years and, in addition, may be fined not more than $20,000. For a second or subsequent offense (as determined under section 7237 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954), the offender shall be imprisoned not less than ten or more than forty years and, in addition, may be fined not more than $20,000.

Whenever on trial for a violation of this subsection the defendant is shown to have or to have had possession of the narcotic drug, such possession shall be deemed sufficient evidence to authorize conviction unless the defendant explains the possession to the satisfaction of the jury."

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
NOV 8 1963
JOHN F. DAVIS, CLERK

Nos. 726, 727, 728, 729, 791 Misc., 899 Misc., 948 Misc.

In the Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1963

ROBERT GRIFFIN, MATTHEW PAIGNEN, CHARLES [illegible], CHARLES TENNEY, ANTHONY PORCELLI, HUGO SCOGGIN ET AL., PETITIONERS

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

ON PETITIONS FOR WRITS OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

MEMORANDUM FOR THE UNITED STATES IN OPPOSITION

ARCHIBALD COX,
Solicitor General,
[illegible],
Assistant Attorney General,
[illegible],
[illegible],
Attorneys,
Department of Justice,
Washington 25, D.C.

INDEX

	Page
Opinion below	1
Jurisdiction	1
Questions presented	2
Statement	2
Argument	10
Conclusion	33

CITATIONS

Cases:

Affronti v. *United States*, 145 F. 2d 3	21
Blumenthal v. *United States*, 332 U.S. 539	15
Glasser v. *United States*, 315 U.S. 60	25
Johnson v. *United States*, 318 U.S. 189	23
Marshall v. *United States*, 360 U.S. 310	18
Rogers v. *United States*, 340 U.S. 367	23
Schaffer v. *United States*, 362 U.S. 511	16
Toliver v. *United States*, 224 F. 2d 742	13
United States v. *Aviles*, 274 F. 2d 179, certiorari denied *sub nom. Evola* v. *United States*, 362 U.S. 974	14
United States v. *Crosby*, 294 F. 2d 928, certiorari denied *sub nom. Mittelman* v. *United States*, 368 U.S. 984	10
United States v. *Feldman*, 299 F. 2d 914, certiorari denied, 370 U.S. 910	10
United States v. *Greenberg*, 200 F. Supp. 382	10
United States v. *Lev*, 276 F. 2d 605, certiorari denied, 363 U.S. 812	21
United States v. *Van Allen*, 208 F. Supp. 331	10

677989—63——1

Constitution and Statutes:

	Page
United States Constitution, Fifth Amendment	29, 30
Civil Rights Act of 1957, Sec. 152, 71 Stat. 638 (amending 28 U.S.C. 1861)	11
21 U.S.C. 173	3
21 U.S.C. 174	3
28 U.S.C. 1861	11
28 U.S.C. 1864	11
New York Election Law, § 150	11

Miscellaneous:

103 Cong. Rec.:	
13154	11
13238	11
13276–13277	11

In the Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1962

Nos. 726, 727, 728, 729, 791 Misc., 899 Misc., 948 Misc.

ROBERT GUIPPONE, MATTHEW PALMIERI, CHARLES SCHIFFMAN, CHARLES TANDLER, ANTHONY PORCELLI, ROCCO SCOPELLITTI AND VITO AGUECI, PETITIONERS

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

ON PETITIONS FOR WRITS OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

BRIEF FOR THE UNITED STATES IN OPPOSITION

OPINION BELOW

The opinion of the court of appeals is reported at 310 F. 2d 817.

JURISDICTION

The judgment of the court of appeals was entered on November 8, 1962. The petition for a writ of certiorari by Porcelli was filed on December 1, 1962. On December 1, 5, and 7, 1962, Mr. Justice Harlan extended the time for filing petitions for writs of certiorari by Palmieri, Scopellitti, Guippone, Schiffman and Tandler to January 7, 1963. Separate petitions for writs of certiorari were filed by Scopellitti on January 5, 1963, and by Guippone, Palmieri, Schiff-

man, and Tandler on January 7, 1963. The petition for a writ of certiorari by Agueci was filed out of time on January 17, 1963.[1] The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. 1254(1).

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the jury commission in the Southern District of New York could properly select the names of prospective grand and petit juries from voting registration lists.

2. Whether the evidence is sufficient to sustain the convictions.

3. Whether publicity denied petitioners a fair trial.

4. Whether there was improper redirect examination of a principal government witness.

5. Whether plain error was committed in the cross-examination of petitioner Porcelli (No. 791 Misc.).

6. Whether petitioner Scopellitti (No. 899 Misc.) was deprived of the assistance of counsel.

7. Whether the summation of the prosecutor was prejudicial.

8. Whether the instructions to the jury were proper.

9. Whether the government's evidence was procured as a result of wiretapping by state officials.

STATEMENT

The seven petitioners, together with five others, went to trial in the Southern District of New York on 18 counts of a 30-count indictment charging viola-

[1] Agueci's petition was filed seventy days after the entry of the judgment in the court below and was not within the time prescribed by the Court's rules.

tions of the narcotics laws.* Count 1 charged a conspiracy from about September 1, 1958, to May 22, 1961 (the date of the indictment), to import, conceal, buy, sell, and dilute narcotic drugs in violation of 21 U.S.C. 173 and 174. The other counts charged substantive narcotics violations of 21 U.S.C. 173 and 174. All the defendants were charged under the conspiracy count. Petitioners Guippone and Porcelli were charged with eleven substantive violations (counts 11 through 13, 17 through 19, 22 through 25 and 29); Schiffman and Tandler were accused of three substantive offenses (counts 8, 16 and 28); Palmieri (count 5), Scopellitti (count 14) and Agueci (count 20) were each charged with one such violation.

The jury found petitioners guilty as charged. Schiffman was sentenced to twenty-five years' imprisonment. Guippone and Palmieri were each sentenced to twenty years' imprisonment. Tandler, Porcelli and Agueci were each sentenced to fifteen years' imprisonment. Scopellitti was sentenced to ten years' imprisonment.

In brief, the evidence showed a scheme whereby valises and trunks brought by Italian immigrants into the United States were used as a means of smuggling narcotics. At the pier, a baker named Matteo Palmeri would pick up this baggage and transport it to his bakery. The narcotics would then be distributed. Of the petitioners here, Vito Agueci and Rocco Sco-

*During the trial one defendant, Barbeto, was found not competent to stand trial. All of the other defendants were convicted. They all appealed except Maiello who died after the trial. LoBue, Valachi and Cottone have not filed petitions for writs of certiorari.

pellitti were connected with the importation, and the other five petitioners were involved in the subsequent distribution. At the trial, the principal government witnesses were two accomplices, the baker Palmeri and Salvatore Rinaldo, both named in the indictment as co-conspirators but not indicted.

Because of the scope and complexity of the conspiracy and because of petitioners' challenges to the sufficiency of the evidence (see pp. 12–16, *infra*), it is necessary that the evidence on which the convictions were based be set out in some detail.

1. The involvement of Palmeri the baker in the scheme began when he accepted Albert Agueci's offer to participate in diamond smuggling and was then introduced to Luigi LoBue and Vincent Mauro. As part of the scheme, Palmeri went to Pier 84 in May 1959, in July 1959, and again in March 1960, and picked up a valise which he transported to his bakery. On each of the first two occasions, Palmeri, upon LoBue's instructions, distributed packages to an unidentified man pointed out by Mauro, who in return paid Palmeri $15,000 and $13,000, respectively, for LoBue. On the second occasion, LoBue told Palmeri they were handling narcotics. Palmeri also saw him package white powder which had been removed from a blanket in the valise (G.A. 2–23).[1]

---

[1] To avoid any possibility of confusion, the names of the petitioners are hereinafter italicized wherever they appear.

[2] The record on file with the clerk of the Court consists of the trial transcript in seven volumes, the original papers and proceedings in the district court and the appendix of the government filed in the court of appeals. The trial transcript is designed herein as "Tr." and the government's appendix as "G.A."

2. The first of two transactions involving *Matthew Palmieri* occurred in July 1959. Shortly before, Frank Caruso found that Salvatore Rinaldo was "interested in delivering junk" and introduced him to Mauro, who in turn placed him in contact with Palmeri the baker (G.A. 18–20, 378–380). Acting on Caruso's instructions, Rinaldo secured one kilogram of narcotics from Palmeri the baker and transferred it to *Palmieri* for $8500. When *Palmieri* quizzed him about the purity of the package, Rinaldo told him to discuss that question with Caruso. Rinaldo turned over the money received to Caruso (G.A. 381–385).

Around March 21, 1960, Rinaldo met *Palmieri* again. After *Palmieri* inquired if the "goods" were as pure as in the prior transaction, Rinaldo sold one kilogram of heroin to *Palmieri* for $8500 (the subject matter of count 5). Rinaldo had previously obtained the substance at Palmeri's bakery. He had also performed tests on the powder which indicated it was heroin (G.A. 399–412).

3. In December 1959, at a meeting of Mauro, Caruso, Rinaldo and Joseph Valachi, Mauro told Rinaldo that Valachi was going to pick up "junk" from them. A few days later Valachi introduced Rinaldo to *Anthony Porcelli*, informing him that *Porcelli* worked for him and would pick up the packages. The next day, Rinaldo gave *Porcelli* one kilogram of narcotics that he had previously obtained from co-conspirator Charles DiPalermo. When payment in full was delayed, Rinaldo told Valachi in *Porcelli's* presence that Caruso did not like the delay (G.A. 386–395). On March 18, 1960, Valachi told Rinaldo that he was

going away and that his interest would be handled by *Porcelli* and Michael Maiello (G.A. 405–409). In April 1960, *Porcelli* brought *Ralph Guippone* to Rinaldo's house, introducing him as a man whom Valachi had mentioned and as a person whom he had known for a long time. *Porcelli* said they could "move some goods" if they obtained it for a reasonable price. When Rinaldo told him the price was $7500, *Porcelli* proposed a three-way partnership. He suggested diluting the narcotics with sugar and selling the excess obtained from the adulteration at a profit. Rinaldo agreed to this arrangement. In May 1960, Rinaldo obtained two packages of narcotics from co-conspirator Salvatore Maneri, after Caruso told him that Maneri was expecting two packages. Rinaldo, *Guippone* and *Porcelli* diluted it with milk sugar. They sold packages weighing a total of two kilograms for $17,400 (G.A. 414–420, 402).

4. At a meeting in April 1960, Mauro and Albert Agueci told Palmeri that narcotics would be imported in trunks with false bottoms instead of valises. John Papalia also attended this meeting. Albert Agueci also said that his brother *Vito* would travel to Italy and would notify Palmeri when a trunk would arrive (G.A. 23–26).[5] That month *Vito Agueci* went to Italy (Govt. Exs. 311–313). In May 1960, Palmeri received a postal letter from *Vito Agueci* in Italy,

[5] In April 1960, there was also a meeting of Caruso, Albert Agueci, Rinaldo and Papalia at which Caruso stated that Albert Agueci and Papalia in Canada would secure goods from Europe and that "we will take care of the distribution down here" (G.A. 412–413).

informing him that a particular passenger would arrive with a trunk on June 2, 1960 (G.A. 26–27).

On June 2, 1960, August 19, 1960, and September 2, 1960, Palmeri brought to his bakery from the pier three separate trunks containing respectively fourteen, ten and sixteen kilograms of powder. On each occasion Rinaldo performed tests on the powder which indicated that it was heroin (G.A. 26–56, 420–424, 436–439, 449–451, 942–946).

5. In June 1960, Rinaldo on advice of Caruso met *Charles Schiffman* at a racetrack. A few days later *Schiffman* introduced Rinaldo to *Charles Tandler* and they agreed that Rinaldo would deliver narcotics to *Tandler*. Several days later, Rinaldo gave three kilograms of "junk" to *Tandler* from the June shipment (the subject matter of count 8) (G.A. 425–430, 939–941). Similar transactions also occurred following the other two shipments. On August 23, 1960, after another meeting with *Schiffman*, Rinaldo delivered three kilograms from the August importation to *Tandler* (the subject matter of count 16) (G.A. 439–440, 945). Again in early October 1960, Rinaldo delivered four kilograms of heroin to Tandler from the September shipment after arrangements had been made with *Schiffman* (count 28). Around October 12, 1960, *Schiffman* and *Tandler* paid Rinaldo $25,000 which he turned over to Caruso (G.A. 461–463, 948–949).

6. On June 24, 1960, *Gaippine, Porcelli* and Rinaldo adulterated three kilograms of heroin from the June shipment. Subsequently *Porcelli* sold three kilograms for which he paid $8500 to Rinaldo, who in turn gave

the money to Caruso (the subject matter of count 11). *Guippone*, *Porcelli* and Rinaldo split an additional $1,500 profit from this sale. Around this time, Rinaldo made two other sales for $4,500, splitting the proceeds with *Guippone* and *Porcelli* (counts 12 and 13) (G.A. 431–434, 942).

In the middle of August 1960, *Guippone*, *Porcelli* and Rinaldo again adulterated two kilograms of heroin from the August shipment. *Porcelli* sold two packages for $16,000. They split $1,000 of this amount and Rinaldo "put $1,500 aside" (the subject matter of count 17). Later in the month, Rinaldo made two additional sales for a total of $5,400, dividing the proceeds with *Porcelli* and Rinaldo (counts 18 and 19) (G.A. 440–444, 945–946).

On September 9 and 10, 1960, *Porcelli*, *Guippone* and Rinaldo diluted four kilograms of narcotics from the September shipment with confectionary sugar. *Porcelli* took two kilograms on each date. In return for each of the two-kilogram packages, *Porcelli* and *Guippone* brought Rinaldo $16,000 (the subject matter of counts 22 and 23). Rinaldo took the money received to Caruso except that he, *Guippone* and *Porcelli* split $500 on each kilogram that they distributed. On September 12 and 13, 1960, Rinaldo sold additional heroin for $5,400, again sharing his receipts with *Guippone* and *Porcelli* (counts 24 and 25); and on October 12, 1960, *Porcelli* took one kilogram for which he and *Guippone* brought Rinaldo $8,000 (count 29) (G.A. 452–454, 456–457, 463–464, 947–949).

7. The August shipment was brought into the United States by *Rocco Scopellitti*. Albert Agueci

had told Palmeri that *Scopellitti* worked for him. After the trunk arrived, Palmeri and *Scopellitti* transported it to the bakery. At the bakery *Scopellitti* told Rinaldo, "Don't worry. I know what it's all about." They opened the trunk and found the packages of powder, weighing ten kilograms, in its false bottom (the subject matter of count 14). *Scopellitti* told Palmeri that he would bring in another trunk whenever requested by Albert Agueci. (G.A. 32–34, 204, 436–439, 691–692, 706–707).

8. Initially Palmeri was unable to secure the September trunk at the pier because he was unable to find the immigrant. Palmeri telephoned Albert Agueci in Canada and was told that *Vito Agueci* would correct the mixup. During the course of the day, Palmeri spoke to *Vito Agueci* over the telephone six to eight times and was advised that an explanatory telegram from Italy had not yet arrived. A few days later a cablegram was sent to *Vito Agueci's* home in Canada containing a particular address. This information was conveyed to Palmeri and Rinaldo who obtained the claim check for the trunk by contacting the address listed on the cablegram (G.A. 36–46, 466–470, 445–449; Govt. Ex. 213). This time Palmeri had mechanical difficulty with his truck. Acting on prior instructions of Albert Agueci, he told Filippo Cottone that he needed transportation for a trunk containing narcotics. Cottone drove his station wagon to the pier where they secured the trunk. Cottone criticized the mixup, stating that he was puzzled because there had been no trouble with the earlier shipments. At the bakery, Cottone, Palmeri and Rinaldo ripped open the trunk's

false bottom and found the packages containing ten kilograms of heroin; after Albert Agueci told Palmeri that there was additional heroin in blankets in the trunk, Rinaldo found six additional kilograms in the blankets (the subject matter of count 20) (G.A. 46–51, 449–451, 946).

9. On October 18, 1960, a conversation between Rinaldo and *Porcelli* on a sidewalk was overheard. *Porcelli* asked, "When can I get ready" and Rinaldo replied, "By Friday night you should be ready to move" (G.A. 1086–1087).

On Friday, October 21, Palmeri and Rinaldo went to the pier to secure another trunk which they loaded in the bakery truck. Palmeri, driving the bakery truck, followed Rinaldo's car. They were both followed by police and federal narcotics agents. On the way, the police and agents stopped their vehicles and arrested them (G.A. 54–56, 465–467, 1087–1091). The truck was seized and was found to contain heroin which was subsequently chemically tested by federal chemists (G.A. 1128–1130). Acting under a search warrant, the police and narcotics agents also seized $21,450, twelve ounces of narcotics and confectionary sugar from a trap at Rinaldo's home (G.A. 467, 1104–1107).

ARGUMENT

1. There is no substance to petitioners' challenge to the method of jury selection employed in the Southern District of New York (No. 728, Pet. 19–22).* See *United States* v. *Greenberg*, 200 F. Supp. 382 (S.D. N.Y.), and *United States* v. *Van Allen*, 208 F. Supp.

* For the most part, each petitioner has adopted general arguments made by the others.

331 (S.D.N.Y.), where similar objections were rejected.

The statute makes any adult citizen eligible for jury duty unless he has been convicted of crime, is unable to read and understand English, or is physically or mentally incapable of rendering efficient service. 28 U.S.C. 1861. The task of selecting qualified persons as prospective jurors has been placed on the jury commission. 28 U.S.C. 1864. Congress has not, however, specified the means by which names of prospective jurors are to be obtained. In the Southern District of New York, names of prospective jurors are selected at random from lists of persons registered to vote in presidential elections. After the names are selected, the prospect appears and an inquiry as to his qualifications is made (Tr. 28-32). Since the qualifications for voting in New York are substantially similar to the federal jury statute (see N.Y. Election Law § 150), the method adopted is a fair procedure for obtaining a representative cross section of the New York community. There is no contention that New York denies any eligible voter the right to register and vote. In a city with the size and heterogeneity of New York, voting lists provide as reasonable a method of securing a cross-section of the community as any.

The amendment of Section 1861 by the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (Section 152, 71 Stat. 638) does not affect this method of selection. This amendment removed the requirement that a person be competent for jury service in the state courts in order to qualify for service on a federal jury. It was designed to prevent state racial discrimination on juries from frustrating the enforcement of the provisions of the Civil Rights Act. See 103 Cong. Rec. 13154, 13238, 13276-13277.

2. Petitioners challenge the sufficiency of the evidence to establish (a) that the white powder in which the defendants were dealing was heroin (No. 728, Pet. 4–8) and (b) that various individual petitioners were linked with the conspiracy (No. 726, Pet. 3–5; No. 727, Pet. 21–28; No. 899 Misc., Pet. 9–11). The sufficiency of the evidence, fully considered by the court below (printed Pets., App. A, pp. 16a–27a), is not an issue warranting review by this Court. In any event, the evidence was clearly sufficient on these points.

(a) There was ample evidence from which the jury could conclude that the white powder imported was heroin. A sample of each shipment of powder in 1960, the subject matter of the substantive counts, was tested by Rinaldo with nitric acid and with mineral oil and heat (G.A. 390, 401, 404, 406, 410, 416, 423, 438, 450). While qualified government chemists in a laboratory would have investigated the powder further, only a single substance, heroin, would have produced the reaction observed by Rinaldo in his tests (G.A. 1121–1122, 1139–1140). The government's case, moreover, did not rest on the tests alone. The secretiveness surrounding the importation and distribution of the powder, the high prices at which the powder was sold and the language used by the petitioners in describing it were among the other circumstances which tended to prove that the powder was heroin. Added to this is the fact that United States chemists tested and found to be heroin both the powder in the last shipment, seized when Rinaldo and Palmeri were arrested on October 21, 1960, and the substance seized from Rin-

aldo's home (G.A. 1087–1089, 1128–1133). See *Toliver v. United States*, 224 F. 2d 742, 745 (C.A. 9).

(b) The evidence as to each individual petitioner was sufficient to support his conviction. As we have noted, this broad scheme operated at two primary levels. There was a central core of conspirators who arranged the exportation of heroin from Italy and its importation into the United States. Another group of conspirators were involved in its distribution in this country. The baker Palmeri and Salvatore Rinaldo (both government witnesses) provided the main link between these two segments of the conspiracy.

Two of the petitioners were connected with the importation. *Scopellitti* brought a trunk containing narcotics into the United States. Whether Rinaldo's testimony should be interpreted, as *Scopellitti* claims (No. 899 Misc., Pet. 10), to show that *Scopellitti* was absent when the narcotics were extracted from the trunk is immaterial. It is clear that *Scopellitti* was present at least when Rinaldo began to break open its false bottom. *Scopellitti's* knowledge of this false bottom together with his statements to Palmeri after the importation that he knew "what it's all about," that he worked for Albert Agueci and that he would bring in another trunk when requested (see pp. 8–9, *supra*) are sufficient to connect him to the narcotics conspiracy. *Vito Agueci* made two trips to Italy to facilitate the importation of narcotics. He acted as a trouble-shooter in determining the difficulty occasioned by the shipment on September 2, 1960, when Palmeri was unable to obtain the trunk at the pier.

The cablegram which led to the trunk's location was sent to his home. See pp. 6–7, 9–10, *supra*. His involvement in the importation was sufficient to link him as a co-conspirator.

The other petitioners, who were tied to the distribution of the narcotics, obtained their supply from Rinaldo. *Guippone* and *Porcelli* assisted Rinaldo regularly, from April to September 1960, in distributing heroin. After the arrival of each shipment, they diluted and packaged heroin at Rinaldo's home. On some sales they would share profits with Rinaldo, and on other sales they would turn over most of the receipts to Rinaldo. In all they were involved in eleven sales from June 25, 1960, to October 12, 1960, that were individually the subject matter of a substantive count. *Schiffman* and *Tandler* on three occasions, June 14, August 16 and October 4, 1960, obtained narcotics valued at $25,000 from Rinaldo. Their participation began when Caruso arranged for Rinaldo to sell narcotics to *Schiffman*. In turn *Schiffman* brought *Tandler* into the conspiracy. They made it possible for the distribution of narcotics to reach another level of supplier. See pp. 5–6, 7–8, *supra*. It is clear that these four petitioners knew or must have known that Rinaldo's activities were part of a larger scheme, success of which would require the unlawful importation of narcotics and their distribution after importation. *United States* v. *Aviles*, 274 F. 2d 179, 188 (C.A. 2), certiorari denied *sub nom. Evola* v. *United States*, 362 U.S. 974. It is immaterial that *Guippone* and *Porcelli* may have been engaged in a separate partnership with Rinaldo distributing narcotics, because their separate

agreement was part of the larger common plan and essential to its success. See *Blumenthal* v. *United States*, 332 U.S. 539.

As to *Palmieri*, the court below found that his guilt had been established under the substantive charge (count 5), but it did not determine his guilt as a conspirator (printed Pets. App. A, 21a). The evidence showed that *Palmieri* purchased narcotics from Rinaldo on two occasions, in July 1959, and again on March 21, 1960. Palmeri the baker was the source of the narcotics both times. The first sale occurred after the co-conspirator Caruso had advised Rinaldo to make arrangements with *Palmieri*, and at delivery Rinaldo told *Palmieri* to discuss with Caruso the purity of the drug sold. On each occasion one kilogram of narcotics was sold for $8,500. See p. 5, *supra*. While there is no direct evidence that Caruso was involved in the second sale, the circumstances were such that the jury could find, in view of the prior sale, that *Palmieri* knew that Rinaldo was selling narcotics on behalf of Caruso. Indeed, *Palmieri* referred to the prior sale. He thus knew that he was furthering the objectives of a narcotics conspiracy consisting of at least Caruso and Rinaldo. That he did not know its complete dimensions or all its participants would not free him of conspiratorial liability. In any event (as the court below noted, printed Pets. App. A, p. 21a), if the conspiracy count fails as to *Palmieri*, his conviction may be sustained upon the substantive count. The trial judge in his charge was careful to compartmentalize the evidence against *Palmieri* (Tr. 6314–6318). The court below, mindful of the problems involved, found that

Palmieri had properly been convicted on the substantive count. See *Schaffer* v. *United States*, 362 U.S. 511.

3. Petitioners contend that certain articles about other alleged members of the conspiracy that appeared in the newspapers during the trial, and of which some of the jurors were aware, deprived them of a fair trial (No. 727, Pet. 3–9; No. 899 Misc., Pet. 11–13; No. 948 Misc., Pet. 7–11). The trial court went to great lengths to assure that petitioners would not be prejudiced by this publicity. We believe that the court's conclusion that a mistrial was not required under the circumstances was a reasonable one.

The jury selected to try the case was impaneled on November 6, 1961 (Tr. 60). About three weeks later, on November 25 and 26, 1961, on a weekend when the case was in recess, newspapers reported that Albert Agueci had been found murdered in a field near Rochester, New York, that Agueci had previously jumped bail in a $150 million narcotics smuggling trial under way in New York, and that this was the second gangland style of slaying of a defendant in the case (William Holmes, another suspected member of the "dope smuggling ring," having been found shot to death in August). The article also reported: "The government charged that Agueci and two other Canadians had for 10 years recruited emigrants from Italy to Canada. Before the emigrants left Italy, the gang would give them steamer trunks with false bottoms containing heroin" (No. 727, Pet. 5–6).

On the following Monday, when the court was back in session, the court examined each juror separately

about the publicity and permitted counsel to submit questions for each juror (G.A. 469–511). The interrogation showed that five jurors had heard or read of the circumstances concerning these deaths. From conversations in the jury room that morning, four other jurors had heard that there had been publicity about the case. The conversations in the jury room did not detail what the publicity was. Of those jurors who heard of the publicity in the jury room, one said that he heard that there had been a death in the family of one of the defendants (G.A. 477); another stated that he was told something had happened to a conspirator not a defendant in the case (G.A. 486); a third said there was a discussion that there was publicity but that nobody stated what it was (G.A. 505); a fourth who arrived late said that she heard "they were all saying there was quite an article in the newspaper" but she did not know the contents of the article and heard no names mentioned (G.A. 506–507). In response to a question whether he had heard any discussion of the publicity in the jury room, one of the jurors who had read the article replied, "I heard nothing definite, but there was just an air in the room that something had happened that I had known about it. I didn't hear anything specifically said" (G.A. 499).

Each juror stated to the court that he would not be influenced by anything read or heard. Upon the request of counsel, jurors were specifically asked if they could give *Vito Agucci* a fair trial. They all said they could. No similar request was made to ask similar questions concerning any other defendant. The court

in its final instructions told the jury that in arriving at its verdict it should be uninfluenced by anything read, heard, seen, or discussed in private conversation (Tr. 6378); it should only consider the evidence presented in court (Tr. 6391).

The problem of how to deal with publicity does not lend itself to rigid formulation. The trial judge has a large area of discretion in deciding whether the jurors have been prejudiced. He has the "feel" of the case and is in a far better position to gauge the effect of such information on a jury than an appellate court. If the harmful effect on the jury is such that it is impossible for a jury to disregard it, then a mistrial should be granted. In making this determination "each case must turn on its special facts." *Marshall* v. *United States*, 360 U.S. 310, 312. The special fact in the *Marshall* case was that the publicity seen by the jurors contained information about the petitioner himself which had previously been excluded as prejudicial by the court and which the government claimed would have refuted his defense of entrapment. The information was closely connected to the defense. Its potent effect had been attested by both the court and the government prior to the appearance of the publicity. In these circumstances this Court found that it was unlikely that jurors could decide the case on the facts of record or that a curative instruction would have been of any avail.

Unlike the *Marshall* case, the publicity here did not relate to any petitioner on trial and did not directly relate to any trial issue. It bore only tangentially on the issues which the jury was called upon

to decide, involving speculation as to the cause or meaning of the deaths. There was thus no substantial likelihood that the jury would decide the guilt of these petitioners on the basis of the extrajudicial information. Since the harmful effect of the publicity was remote, the judge could consider and give weight to the belief of the jurors that they could disregard the publicity. An honest and conscientious juror could disregard this extrajudicial information and determine the guilt and innocence of each petitioner on the evidence presented in court. The conclusion of the trial court that they would not be swayed by the publicity was a reasonable one.

At worst, the circumstances disclosed by the publicity are analogous to those cases where some defendants have entered pleas of guilty, and the jury has been informed of such pleas. As long as the jury is aware that such pleas should not be considered, it has been held that trial courts may deny requests for mistrials. See *United States* v. *Feldman*, 299 F. 2d 914 (C.A. 2), certiorari denied, 370 U.S. 940; *United States* v. *Crosby*, 294 F. 2d 928, 948–950 (C.A. 2), certiorari denied *sub nom. Mittelman* v. *United States*, 368 U.S. 984.[8]

---

[8] Of the counts on trial, Albert Agueci was named as a defendant in only the conspiracy count, and William Holmes was named as a defendant in the conspiracy count and in two of the eleven substantative counts in which *Guippone* and *Porcelli* were defendants.

[9] *Palmieri* also argues (No. 727, Pet. 6–9) that he was prejudiced by publicity resulting from a state court narcotics trial involving defendants with Italian names. His claim that the common subject matter of the trials and the Italian names were harmful is without merit. It was made clear to the

4. During the redirect examination of Salvatore Rinaldo, the government was permitted to introduce into evidence portions of statements made by the witness on October 23 and 24, 1960, to state officials, including a state district attorney named Facelle (G.A. 950–987). The court, both at the time of admission and in its final charge, instructed the jury that these statements were admitted only on the issue of credibility (Tr. 3440–3442, 6382–6383).

Petitioners *Tandler* and *Schiffman* argue that this evidence was improper because nothing in their cross-examination opened the door for this evidence (No. 729, Pet. 14–16). The record shows, however, that the trial court did not abuse its discretion in admitting the evidence. Rinaldo was cross-examined at great length by the attorney for *Tandler* and *Schiffman* (G.A. 511–606, 927–935) and by the other attorneys (G.A. 606–926). Counsel for *Tandler* and *Schiffman* alluded to the October 23 and 24 statements, as well as to other statements made by Rinaldo on October 31, 1960, and January 26 and 27, 1961. Thus, he asked if Rinaldo had been interviewed by Facelle several days after his arrest (which had taken place on October 21, 1960) and whether the statement on January 26, 1961, reflected matters he had previously told Facelle (G.A. 535–537, 747). He also asked Rinaldo if he recalled mentioning *Schiffman* and *Tandler* in his January 26, 1961, statement; the witness replied that he did not remember (G.A. 606).

---

one juror who was confused on names that the state case involved an individual named Russo and not Caruso (Tr. 965).

Counsel's implied comparison between the January 26 statement and the statements Rinaldo had made shortly after his arrest (*i.e.*, the October 23 and 24 statements) plainly opened up the question of what the latter statements contained, and it was proper for government counsel to read relevant portions of them into the record. Moreover, the cross-examination could have left the jury with the impression that Rinaldo had not mentioned either *Schiffman* or *Taudler* in his various statements; it was thus proper to show that he had in fact mentioned these two in his October statements (G.A. 960–961, 975–976, 987). Under the circumstances, it was well within the trial court's discretion to allow portions of the October statements to be read into the record on redirect examination. See *United States* v. *Lee*, 276 F. 2d 605, 608 (C.A. 2), certiorari denied, 363 U.S. 812; *Affronti* v. *United States*, 145 F. 2d 3, 7–8 (C.A. 8).

5. Petitioner *Porcelli* testified in his own behalf that he was in the policy gambling business with Rinaldo and *Guippone* between March and the end of September 1960, the period of time that Rinaldo's testimony placed him actively in narcotics transactions (G.A. 1147–1148). This relationship terminated, he said, because Rinaldo cheated his partners. On direct examination, he also testified that he never sold narcotics or conspired to violate the narcotics laws at any time (Tr. 4991–4992). On cross-examination he detailed how his wagering business operated (G.A. 1155–1165), admitting that he knew it was a crime to be in the gambling business without a federal tax

stamp (Tr. 5026). When asked if he was in the gambling business in 1959, he responded that he might have been but was not sure; he did not know (G.A. 1167). He then testified that he did not know if he was in the gambling business in 1957 or 1958. At this point, when his lawyer asked the court to instruct *Porcelli* that he could assert his constitutional privilege against answering, the court allowed *Porcelli* to consult with his attorney. When *Porcelli* returned to the witness stand he declined to answer separate questions as to whether he was in the gambling business in the years 1941 through 1948, on the ground of self-incrimination (G.A. 1168–1170). No objection was made to any of these questions. On redirect, his counsel elicited testimony that *Porcelli* was 14 or 15 years old in 1943 (G.A. 1170). No comment was made on this claim of privilege in closing argument. The court in its instructions told the jury that no adverse inference should be drawn from the assertion by any witness of the privilege against self-incrimination (Tr. 6384).

Under *Porcelli's* direct testimony, it became a relevant issue to determine whether he had engaged in wagering activities at times other than the period of the indictment. *Porcelli's* testimony that he had not sold narcotics at any time also opened up a wide area for cross-examination. It was thus proper for the prosecution to cross-examine him as to whether he had been in the gambling business in other years. While perhaps it would have been better practice, once it became clear that *Porcelli* would probably

claim the privilege,[10] for the prosecutor to have asked one broad question, petitioner's counsel did not object to the reference to each year. Moreover, any prejudice resulting from this interrogation was dispelled by the court's instructions.

6. Petitioner *Scopellitti* was represented at the trial by appointed counsel Jerome Lewis, the retained counsel for defendant Filippo Cottone. *Scopellitti* claims that his indigence resulted in a denial to him of assistance of counsel because Lewis could not effectively represent both him and Cottone (No. 899 Misc., Pet. 17–21).

Scopellitti, who had been arraigned on July 21, 1961, had indicated to the court that his brother was going to come from Canada and make arrangements to retain D. M. Markowitz to represent him, and Markowitz was named as attorney to protect his rights up to the trial time (S. Tr. 10).[11] On August 3, 1961, Markowitz, who also represented Albert Agueci and *Vito Agueci*, included *Scopellitti* as a movant in a joint motion for a bill of particulars. The court on August 24, 1961, granted in part various motions for a bill of particulars filed by the different defendants. On August 29, 1961, the question of appointment of trial counsel for *Scopellitti* came before the court, (S. Tr. 1). *Scopellitti* told the court that his brother

[10] In light of his direct examination, it seems likely that *Porcelli* had waived his right to refuse to testify on grounds of self-incrimination. Cf. *Rogers* v. *United States*, 340 U.S. 367; *Johnson* v. *United States*, 318 U.S. 189.

[11] We are lodging with the Clerk of the Court the transcript of certain proceedings on August 29, 1961, here designated as "S. Tr."

was sick and could not come from Canada and that he himself had no money with which to engage a lawyer. The court said it would assign counsel and asked Markowitz if he was aware of any conflict that might exist between *Scopellitti* and the other defendants whom he represented. Markowitz, who at the time represented five defendants, said that he needed the help of associate counsel to handle so many defendants' (S. Tr. 11).[12] The court then asked if any attorney who represented other defendants who had no conflict of interest would defend *Scopellitti* so that it would not be necessary to draft an attorney to try a case scheduled to last four weeks. The court then asked Jerome Lewis, Cottone's attorney, as to his position. Lewis said that he represented a defendant who never had been arrested and that, as a matter of trial strategy, he would not represent a second defendant with an arrest record. He was assured that *Scopellitti* had no such record. The court suggested that Lewis talk to *Scopellitti* and stated: "For the time being I will assign you. I would very much appreciate if after you satisfy yourself there is no conflict of interest you can do it. * * * If you can protect your client's interest by doing this, I would appreciate it" (S. Tr. 11–14). The court, through an Italian interpreter, told *Scopellitti* that he was appointing Mr. Lewis "who represents another defendant, to act as [your] lawyer" and that Lewis was a very able lawyer of very great experience. *Scopellitti* indicated

[12] In addition to Albert and *Vito Alguci*, Markowitz represented Arnold Barbeto, Frank Caruso, and Salvatore Maneri.

that he understood (S. Tr. 14). The trial itself began on October 27, 1961, and Lewis acted as attorney for both Cottone and *Scopellitti*.[15]

There is a hollow ring to *Scopellitti*'s argument that his indigence forced him to share an attorney with another defendant. *Scopellitti* himself had sought to retain an attorney who, with his associate, represented five other defendants. The court, in appointing a lawyer who represented one other defendant, did what *Scopellitti* was trying to obtain funds to do. His poverty did not compel him to have the assistance of counsel who represented another. Unlike *Glasser* v. *United States*, 315 U.S. 60, the court did not thrust dual representation upon an unwilling defendant. Mr. Lewis, an experienced attorney, made a pretrial investigation and saw no injury either to retained or appointed client. He made no objections on that ground during the trial. There is no basis for a claim of injustice now.

The record shows no conflict of interest between Cottone and *Scopellitti*. The testimony tying *Scopellitti* and Cottone to the crimes charged centered on separate shipments. *Scopellitti* brought a trunk involved in the August shipment from Italy to the United States and assisted Palmeri and Rinaldo in removing the narcotics from its false bottom at the bakery (see pp. 8–9, *supra*). Cottone lent his station

[15] Of the twelve defendants who went on trial, only three, Maiello, *Palmieri* and Valachi, had separate counsel. *Vito Agueci* and Barbeto were represented jointly by Markowitz and a Mr. Krum. The other clients of Markowitz had become fugitives. LaBue, *Guippone* and *Porcelli* had the same lawyer. *Schiffman* and *Tandler* also had joint representation.

wagon and his labor for the removal of the September trunk from the pier, and assisted in the removal of narcotics. There is nothing in the record that even suggests the possibility that the defense of *Scopellitti* was inhibited by counsel's representation of Cottone. The case against both depended in large measure on the credibility of Palmeri and Rinaldo. Lewis cross-examined both of them extensively to try to impeach their credibility generally (G.A. 170–261, 606–714) and particularly on behalf of both *Scopellitti* (G.A. 199–206, 665, 690–698, 706–707) and Cottone (G.A. 206–261, 666, 698–709). Both *Scopellitti* and Cottone testified in their own behalf (G.A. 1142–1146). Lewis made an extensive closing argument for each (Tr. 5945, *et seq.*, and 5993, *et seq.*). The jury was advised that the court had appointed Mr. Lewis to represent *Scopellitti* and that his appointment was without fee (Tr. 4665, 5941). The record is thus barren of any prejudice flowing from his dual representation.[1]

7. *Scopellitti* (No. 899 Misc., 14–17, 20) and *Palmeri* (No. 727, 16–21) argue that the reference to Mr. Lewis' representation of both *Scopellitti* and Cottone made in the course of the government's three-hour summation to the jury (Tr. 6062–6187) was so prejudicial as to compel a mistrial. The prosecutor argued that it would be an amazing coincidence if the theories of the defendants, as expressed in the closing

[1] The admission into evidence of the pretrial statement of *Scopellitti* has no relevance to the issue of the quality of his legal representation. *Scopellitti* was not denied the opportunity to object to its admissibility at the trial and its admission into evidence could in no way benefit Cottone.

argument of counsel, were true. He then pointed out various specific coincidences to the jury. He argued that Cottone and *Scopellitti* were represented by the same lawyer; that in a pretrial statement, Cottone had said he had never gone to the pier during 1960; that *Scopellitti* had said he brought only two items of personal luggage with him; and that both did not know what their interviewers were talking about. The prosecutor then stated that it might have been expected that they would testify to these same facts at the trial. He then argued: "They are both represented by Mr. Lewis. Both of them take the stand and both of them have almost identical defenses." He then referred to their trial testimony, which was similar in that each said he transported a trunk as a favor to another, unaware of its contents. The prosecutor then noted another coincidence in the case: that both *Vito Agucci* and *Scopellitti* gave the same reason for traveling to Europe—visits to sick relatives (G.A. 1177–1179).

It is clear that, if the prosecutor had not mentioned Mr. Lewis in his argument, his summation would have not been subject to criticism. It was proper to argue that it was suspicious that both *Scopellitti* and Cottone had made dissimilar pretrial statements, but that their trial testimony was similar and not in accord with their earlier statements. It was likewise proper argument to point out that *Scopellitti* and *Vito Agucci* both testified that they had visited Europe during the same period of time for the same reason. The emphasis of this portion of the closing statement was on the improbability of such corresponding circumstances.

The reference to Mr. Lewis was minor in the *Scopelliti*-Cottone coincidence, and was completely absent from the *Scopelliti*-*Agueci* coincidence. Viewed in the context of the lengthy trial, it would not convey the impression that Mr. Lewis had suborned perjury. In no event is there any basis for concluding that any of the petitioners was prejudiced by the reference to Mr. Lewis.

8(a). Petitioners claim (No. 727, Pet. 9–16) "plain error" in the conspiracy instructions, contending that they did not require that a defendant have knowledge of the illegal importation of narcotic drugs. Examination of the instructions (Tr. 6205–6396, 6445–6446) shows that the jury was adequately charged on this issue. The court instructed the jury that it must find a narcotics conspiracy among the persons charged as conspirators during the time set forth in the indictment and the commission of an overt act. The jury was also told it must find as part of this conspiracy either that narcotic drugs were unlawfully imported into the United States or that the drugs were received after importation with knowledge of their illegal importation or that "the said narcotic drugs" were adulterated prior to distribution. Finally, the jury was instructed that "[t]he fourth and final element you would have to find as to each of the defendants is that he knowingly became a member of the conspiracy" (Tr. 6247–6251). The court in explaining knowledge stated that it was not necessary that a conspirator be fully informed as to all details of the conspiracy, provided he had "knowledge of at least some of the common basic purposes and of the central or

primary objectives and aims of the conspiracy" (Tr. 6254). Since the common basic purpose of the conspiracy here was trafficking in illegally imported drugs, it was clear, as the court below found (printed Pets. App. A, pp. 13a–16a), that the instructions did require a finding that each defendant had knowledge that the central objective of the conspiracy was importing or distributing illegally imported drugs.

(b) Defendants Lo Bue, *Palmieri*, Valachi and *Tandler* did not testify. As to the first three, the court charged separately that the particular defendant's failure to testify created no inference against him, and that the jury should not consider that fact in its deliberations (Tr. 6301, 6306, 6385). As to *Tandler*, after the court instructed that his failure to testify created no inference against him, the court stated: "As you know, under the Constitution, Fifth Amendment, no defendant in a criminal case can be compelled to be a witness against himself; and that means that in a criminal case a defendant has the prerogative and privilege not to testify, and the fact that he does not testify does not, in any way, directly or indirectly, permit you to draw any inference adverse to the defendant. A defendant has the right to put the government to its proof" (Tr. 6358–6359). When petitioners objected to the reference to the Fifth Amendment, the court gave a supplemental charge stressing that a defendant has an unqualified right not to testify, that no inference should be drawn from his failure to testify, and that the legal theory for this rule was immaterial (Tr. 6445).

The reference to the Fifth Amendment did not, as *Tandler* contends (No. 729, Pet. 3–13), constitute an unfavorable comment by the court on his failure to testify. The jury knew from the testimony presented by the various defendants in the case that each defendant had an option to testify or not as he saw fit. The jury was properly told not to draw any inference from the failure of any defendant to testify. The mere statement that the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution provides that no defendant in a case can be compelled to testify did not turn these words of the cautionary instruction inside out and create its antithesis—that adverse inferences should be drawn against such defendants.

(c) There is no merit in the contention advanced by *Schiffman* (No. 728, Pet. 9–18) that the trial judge did not properly compartmentalize the circumstantial evidence relating to a particular substantive count against a particular defendant. The court instructed the jury that it must be convinced that the substance involved in each substantive count was heroin. It charged that as to each count the jury must determine, count by count, "whether or not the Government's evidence as it relates to each count proves that the substance was heroin hydrochloride to the knowledge of the defendant or defendants named in that count. It is your recollection and your recollection alone that determines whether or not the following items advanced by the Government's contentions prove, with respect to each substantive count, concerning which the asserted items of proof respectively relate, that the substance was heroin hydrochloride" (Tr.

6280–8261). The court then summarized the seven general contentions which, in the government's view, showed that the substance involved was heroin, of which the test performed by Rinaldo was one (printed Pets. App. A, p. 23a). As to each of these items, it also set forth the general defense position (Tr. 6282–6286). In so far as these general items related to a number of counts, the court was not obliged to repeat them as to each. The court concluded this phase of the charge by again telling the jury that it "must decide on the basis of all the evidence as you recall it, on a count by count basis, whether or not it was actual heroin, or heroin hydrochloride" (Tr. 6287). The court later discussed the issues as they related to each count and each defendant, summarizing the contentions of the government and each defendant (Tr. 6301–6370). A reading of the charge shows that it was painstaking in its compartmentalization. The jury was adequately instructed to determine the guilt of each petitioner on a personal basis.

9. Between September 23 and some time in October, 1960, pursuant to an order of a state court, state officials placed a wiretap on the telephone line of Salvatore Rinaldo. In the middle of October they also tapped the telephone of the Galeria Dominic, an art gallery in which Rinaldo had an interest. After holding extensive hearings (Tr. 6562–7457), the trial court concluded that "[t]he Federal Government's case against these convicted defendants was completely free from the taint of wiretapping" (Tr. 7456–7457). Petitioners attack this conclusion primarily on the ground that the testimony which supports this conclu-

sion was incredible (No. 726, Pet. 5–7; No. 728, Pet. 23–28).

The record shows the following:

Rinaldo was under surveillance by both federal agents and state officials (G.A. 1180, 1208). In late August or early September, William Holmes told a federal narcotics agent that Rinaldo was operating the art gallery (G.A. 1204–1205). On September 8, 1960, a federal narcotics agent purchased narcotics from Maiello, one of the co-conspirators (G.A. 1113–1117). Maiello and Holmes, as the trial evidence disclosed, had purchased narcotics from Rinaldo (G.A. 418–420). On September 23, state officials began their wiretap. In the first part of October, state officials began working with the Bureau of Narcotics in the investigation of Rinaldo (G.A. 1181). The two investigations, although overlapping, were kept separate (G.A. 1202, 1206–1207). The federal officials had no knowledge of the wiretap (G.A. 1208–1211). The state officials, involved in the wiretap, testified that they disclosed no information obtained from the taps to federal agents (G.A. 1184, 1185, 1188, 1190). By understandable coincidence, on October 18, 1960, state and federal officials both observed *Porcelli* meet Rinaldo at the art gallery. A narcotics agent requested a state deputy sheriff to walk near Rinaldo and *Porcelli* for the purpose of overhearing their conversation. The sheriff overheard one of them tell the other to be ready on Friday night (G.A. 1204–1205, 1207). Friday was October 21, the day on which state and federal officials followed Rinaldo and Palmeri and subsequently arrested them (see p. 10, *supra*).

The record thus furnishes ample support for the trial court's conclusion that this prosecution arose from sources other than wiretapping by the State.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, we respectfully submit that the petition for a writ of certiorari should be denied.

ARCHIBALD COX,
Solicitor General.
HERBERT J. MILLER, JR.,
Assistant Attorney General.
BEATRICE ROSENBERG,
SIDNEY M. GLAZER,
Attorneys.

MARCH 1963.